THE

Nonconformists ADVOCATE:

Or, A farther

ACCOUNT

Of their

JUDGMENT

IN

Certain things in which they are misunderstood.

Written Principally in Vindication of

A LETTER from a Minister to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for his Nonconformity,

Modestly answering the Exceptions of *two violent Opposers* of the said REASONS.

LONDON,
Printed for *Thomas Simmons*, at the Prince's Arms in *Ludgate-Street*, M DC LXXX.

Nonconformists

ADVOCATE:

Or A farther

ACCOUNT

Of their

JUDGMENT

IN

Certain things in which they are misunderstood.

Written Principally in Vindication of

A LETTER from a Minister to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for his Nonconformity,

Modestly answering the Exceptions of Conscientious Ogeers of the said REASONS.

LONDON,

Printed for Thomas Simmons, at the Princess Arms in Ludgate-Street, MDCLXXX.

THE EPISTLE TO THE READER

Courteous Reader,

SOme years ſince I was called upon by a Perſon of Quality, *to acquaint her Ladyſhip with the reaſons of my* Non-conformity: *for it had been ſuggeſted to her Ladyſhip, that I had none; but only was ſwayed by the Example of ſome others, much reverenced by me, to tread in their ſteps, at all adventures. As if I had been one of thoſe mentioned by Origen in his firſt Book againſt* Celſus, *who choſe* τὴν αἵρεσιν ταύτην *to be of this Sect and Party, not out of any ſound mind and judgment,* ἀλλ' ἀλόγῳ τινὶ φορᾷ *but by a certain* illogical hurry of determination without all deliberation. *Upon this I was neceſſitated, to put pen to paper, and give her Ladyſhip ſuch an haſty account, as the time would permit: which was under the limit of five or ſix days. I could not therefore ſearch into all things affording matter of ſcruple, they being too large and numerous; but only ſingled out thoſe mentioned in my letter, as being next at hand, and moreover obvious, and eaſie to be underſtood by her Ladyſhip, at the firſt reading of them. A Copy of this letter, ſuch as it was, without adding, diminiſhing, or the leaſt alteration, was appointed to be printed about three months ſince:*

but printed it was not a long time after; at leaſt I ſuppoſed ſo. But when I deemed no ſuch matter, my Copy was brought unto me printed, together with a printed Confutation of it at the ſame time in Quarto. This ſeemed ſtrange to me, but I being in that inſtant oppreſſed with bitter grief, by the death of a darling-Child, was not in a condition to read it over, much leſs to juſtifie my ſelf againſt it. And now within leſs than a week after, another ſecond Confutation was directed to me, upon which I thought I had a loud call, notwithſtanding my great indiſpoſition, to undertake mine opponents, and make good my reaſons againſt all their gainſayings. With what evidence of truth, I muſt leave you and others to judge, my ſheets are now ready for the Preſs, but when that will give them a more publique Paſsport, I know not. Farewell.

October, 27.
1679.

ERRATA.

PAge, 8. *The four laſt lines muſt not be read.* p. 15. l. 3. *quæ tales,* r. *quâ tales,* p. 51. l. 13. *after the word likewiſe the word* is *muſt be put in,* p. 53. l. 20. *after the word condition the word* of *muſt be put in,* p. 61. l. 33. *Aucupare* r. *aucupari. Several other faults about the ſtops left to be corrected by the reader.*

A REFUTATION, &c.

SIR,

BEfore you would confute me, you thought meet to defame me, in theſe words; *Being lately in a Bookſellers Shop, I met with a Letter pretended to be writ from a Miniſter to a Perſon of Quality, ſhewing ſome Reaſons of his Non-conformity.* And you add, *I have often obſerved this humour in ſome mean, but vain people, who dare not look upon Perſons of Quality, when they are preſent, to talk of them with great familiarity, and as their peculiar Intimates and Confidents.* But I anſwer; Why ſhould you a Miniſter be ſo cenſorious and uncharitable, as to charge one who is ſtiled a Miniſter, and I ſuppoſe utterly unknown to your ſelf, with Pride and Lying at the firſt daſh? with Pride, in a vain humour of aſpiring unto acquaintance with Perſons of Quality; with Lying, in pretending unto ſuch a familiarity, when indeed there is no ſuch matter. The Printer, or ſome other, affixed this Title, for my Copy had none at all; but yet it is altogether truth; though I have reaſon to bluſh, and crave pardon for being no more mannerly and Courtly in my Stile and Addreſs to ſuch a Perſon of Honour. By this, and what follows, I obſerve in you a ſtrange Spirit, which I pray God convince you of, and deliver me from; a ſpirit haughty and ſcornful, bitter and revengeful, and yet elſewhere too too friendly and amicable.

Page 1.

Sir, You ſtile me *Gentleman*, again and again, ironically and contemptuouſly enough; and what I have written, you call it *Stuff to impoſe upon the injudicious Rabble, and parallel it with Poor Robin*; and many ſuch opprobrious reflections you faſten upon it. This is pride and ſcorning; *which can never ſatisfie* (as you would be thought to aim at) *an honeſt impartial Inquirer*, but much rather cloud his eyes from beholding, and harden his heart from receiving, whatſoever can be offered (though with far more powerful and perſwading Oratory than your own) to change his mind, or turn him into another Path.

p. 2. l. 16. p. 2. l. 7, 10, 11. p. 2. l. 17.

2.l. antepenult. *Sir*, You *alarm the Magiſtrates and Governours to a jealouſie againſt us*: wherein you ſufficiently ſignifie, not only your grief and grudging at our preſent Indulgency, but alſo your deſire to have us made Examples for daring to mutter a word, and pleading on our own behalf, though purpoſely to ſhew that we are not *wilful, fanatical, and obſtinate in our non-conformity* (which is commonly objected againſt us) but have in *our own apprehenſions inſuperable objections* blocking up the way, and obſtructing us from complying. But what is it not enough that we are removed *ab Officio & Beneficio*, unleſs alſo we be further perſecuted and torn in pieces by the Secular Powers? What muſt a μὴ ἴδῃ, our utter ruine and deſtruction be the Epilogue? This is bitter malice in extremity, far from the good Spirit of God, which was ſeen in the ſhape of a *Dove*, but never in the appearance of a *Vulture*, or Bird of Prey.

p. 10. l. 23. *Sir*, You plead for the *truth of Apocrypha*, yea of the moſt exploded parts of it: here your fierce frowns againſt poor *Non-conformiſts* are turned into ſweet and gracious ſmiles upon the *Roman* Party, as if Father *Parſons*, *Campian*, and ſuch others, had your heart already; and you hereby intimate before-hand (if the Wind ſhall ever turn to that Corner, which God in his great mercy keep off) how willingly and eaſily you could turn about with it into their Tents.

Sir, You quarrel my Introduction, and charge it with the want p. 2. l. 21. *of ſenſe and Grammar*, but you ſhew not wherein, and I am pretty confident you cannot; both the *Syntax* of it, and my mind in it being plain and obvious to every School-boy; but I well perceive the very firſt ſight of my Sheet, fronted with the moſt odious word of *Non-conformity* (ſo great is your diſtaſt againſt us) immediately rufled your patience, and like the appearance of Purple or Scarlet before the eyes of an *Elephant*, put you preſently in a paſſion; which miſted your underſtanding, and hindered you from diſcerning, what, to an unprejudiced perſon, would be moſt clear and intelligible.

Our great difference is in making a juſt Comment, and in finding out the true ſenſe and meaning of the words of the firſt Declaration. Here by the way there is juſt matter of complaint, that the ſaid words ſhould need any Comment; for I look upon this

this Declaration (thus openly to be made before the face of God, and the whole Congregation) of the ſame nature, and congenerous with an Oath; wherein things ought to be expreſſed perſpicuouſly and evidently, the ſenſe of them eaſie and fixedly the ſame to every underſtanding; and this, if poſſible, beyond all ſcruple or heſitation; and not like *Delph* Oracles, with their meaning doubtful, intricate, and involved; and as occaſion ſhall ſerve, ἐξ ἀμφιδόκιτε quickly to be turned from what at the firſt hearing they ſeemingly imported and intended.

You ſay *Aſſent and Conſent* intend no more than *Uſe and Submiſſion, and that this is all in effect which is required of the Conforming Clergy*: I wiſh it had been ſo worded in the Declaration, and inſtead of ſaying, *I A. B. do declare my unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained and preſcribed in and by the Book, entituled the Book of Common Prayer*; we might have ſaid, *I A. B. will ſubmit to the uſe of all and every thing contained in*, &c. Becauſe for peace ſake I can ſubmit, where I do not *like and chuſe*; and in this ſenſe (notwithſtanding your ſcorn of *a very wiſe and grave obſervation*) I do yet take the words *Aſſent* and *Conſent*, and am not removed from my firſt apprehenſion and explanation of them. p.9.l.10 p.7.l.18.

In the words of the Declaration there is an Agent, an act, the object: The Agent is the Perſon or Miniſter declaring, and this unfeignedly and ſincerely from his heart; the Act is this perſon his aſſenting and conſenting: Now this act of aſſenting, as to the Party declaring, relates to his underſtanding; and as to the thing aſſented to, relates to the truth and rightfulneſs of it: So likewiſe again, the act of conſenting relates to his will, and as to the thing conſented to, to the goodneſs, expediency, and behooffulneſs of it. This is what you deride, and hold that the intervention of truth and goodneſs need not be ſuppoſed as a neceſſary ingredient to what we declare we aſſent and conſent unto; but in ſo declaring we mean and intend only this, that we will ſubmit *to the uſe of all and every thing* contained and preſcribed, *&c.* whether they be in their own nature (if ſtrictly examin'd) *moſt eligible and behooffull* to be obſerved and practiſed, yea or not. Now this your Expoſition of *aſſent and conſent*, I look upon as weak and faulty, no more coming up to the full purport of the words conſidered in themſelves, than to the purpoſe of the Law-makers, p.7.l.23. 24. p.7.l.25.

who framed and injoyned them to be declared. For I take it for granted, that this Declaration was thus worded by the moſt Reverend Clergy, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Deans, and ſuch other Divines, and this too for Divines and Miniſters of the Goſpel to be declared by them, as the teſt of their worthineſs and meetneſs for the Miniſterial Function; accordingly therefore ſuch perſons may rationally and well be ſuppoſed to uſe the words in *ſenſu Theologico*, in a Divine or Scriptural ſenſe, and not otherwiſe: Now in the Scripture phraſe we find *aſſent and conſent*, fully and altogether according to the expoſition which I have given of them. As for example ſake, *we have found this man a peſtilent fellow, and a mover of Sedition among the* Jews; *and the* Jews *aſ-*
Act. 24. 9. *ſented, ſaying, Theſe things were ſo. Aſſented*, that is, they *avouched* what *Tertullus* had witneſſed againſt *Paul*, *was the very truth. Shall not their Cattel, and their ſubſtance, and every beaſt of theirs*
Gen. 34. 23. *be ours? Let us conſent unto them, and they will dwell with us. Let us conſent unto them*, that is, let us *willingly and readily chuſe and imbrace their terms, ſince the end obtained by them will be ſo good and gainful, ſo beneficial and profitable for us.* Thus S. *Paul*
Ro. 7. 16. ſaith, *I conſent unto the Law, that it is good*, ὅτι καλὸς, *eo quod*, or *therefore, becauſe it is good.* Thus generally theſe words are taken in the deſcription of Faith among Divines, who tell and teach us, that Faith is made up of theſe three parts, *Aſſent*, *Conſent*, and *Affiance*. Faith, as it is *aſſent*, *acknowledgeth and avoweth the truth and certainty of Goſpel-Revelation*, eſpecially concerning the *Meſſiah*, and the promiſe of life by and through him: Faith as it is *conſent*, *imbraceth and receiveth the bleſſing and goodneſs of this promiſe*, *as moſt behoofful and advantagious* unto us: And from hence is excited readily, chearfully, and thankfully to cloſe in with Chriſt upon his own Conditions and Propoſals, as the only way to happineſs: Faith, as it is *affiance*, reſteth and relieth upon the veracity of the Speaker, and ſtability of the Covenant to felicitate our ſtate, and ſave us from all the evil and miſery ſin hath brought upon us. By what I have ſpoken, we may the better perceive the genuine force and meaning of *aſſent and conſent*; the Object of theſe acts now therefore offers it ſelf to our conſideration, which I ſay (according to the Declaration) *is all and every thing contained and preſcribed in and by the Book intituled the Book*

of

of Common Prayer; whereas you, as a general *Salvo*, ſuppoſe the word *Uſe* to be the next object or matter of thoſe acts on which they terminate; as thus, *I aſſent and conſent to the uſe*, or doing of all *thoſe things contained in, and preſcribed by, &c.* But now is this ſeemly or tolerable in a moſt ſolemn Proteſtation, or an Oath, to have the main matter of it brought in only by the blind Wicket and back-door of a ſuppoſition? why was not this word openly mentioned and expreſſed? why was it not enjoyned us thus to declare, *I aſſent and conſent to the uſe and doing of all and every thing contained, &c?* How can we know the Law-makers intended, or will admit of any ſuch a *Subaudi*? What you mention as *their Preface to the Declaration* is ſomewhat, but not ſufficient; my Reaſon is this; becauſe in the Book of Common-Prayer there are *Credenda*, as well as *Agenda*, things of Faith, as well as of Practice; yea, ſome things only of Faith, and not of Practice: Now I cannot but think our Law-makers in commanding this Declaration, did as zealouſly and carefully deſign the conformity of our Faith, even as of our practice, to the Frame and Model of Theology contained in the Liturgy: I am ſure, in right reaſon, the firſt ought to be aimed at by them, before the laſt. and the laſt only as the reſult of the firſt, unleſs they thought all Conformiſts ζῶα ἄλογα bruit Animals, rather than rational Creatures; ſurely they would not thus reproach them of their own Coat, who bear themſelves high upon their own underſtanding above others, and think it but Juſtice to be reputed the moſt ſapient and judicious amongſt men. It appears by the woful event, that more than a thouſand Non-conforming Miniſters could not thus conſtrue the words of the Declaration, when it was firſt put unto them, and required of them; which (with ſome other things commanded) made them to turn out, and loſe all, rather than loſe their Souls, in doing what was clearly againſt their Conſciences. So that it is not perverſeneſs and folly (what-ever you ſay or think) to ſtick at the words *aſſent and conſent*, but rather from the dictates of a ſound mind, influenced and awed by the fear of the Lord.

p. 17. l. 33.

p. 3. l. 21.

Sir, Far beyond my deſert, by the good Providence of God, I have had the favour and countenance of ſeveral great Perſons of Quality, who have received me very lovingly and familiarly:

This

This I ſpeak (my Witneſs is in Heaven) neither to vaunt my ſelf with the glory of it, nor yet to put you under any diſarray again by the vanity of my pretenſion, but to acquaint you with ſomething to our purpoſe in the matter before us. A little before the black *Bartholomew*, one of the foreſaid in diſcourſe enquired of me, what mine intentions were? and whither I would conform, yea or not? I anſwered his Lordſhip, ſuch things were required and enjoyned, as I could not ſwallow, and therefore ſhould be neceſſitated to march off, and ſound a Retreat. His Lordſhip ſeemed to be much concerned for me, uſing many Arguments (as good as ever I have heard or read from any) to reconcile me to a compliance; but perceiving me not to be overcome by them, while I urged ſome of theſe things now mentioned as a juſt cauſe of my refuſing; at laſt he ſaid with a ſigh, *I wiſh it had been otherwiſe; but they were reſolved either to reproach you, or undo you.* Of which wiſe and weighty Apothegm I leave you to be the Interpreter. Was not Conformity contrived in ſuch a way and manner on purpoſe, either to expoſe us to common Infamy, as Perſons who would ſay, and ſwear, and do any thing, rather than loſe our Livings? or elſe to ruine and undo us, by turning us out a grazing in the woful wild of extreme poverty and want? About a year after another great Peer ordered me to wait on his Lordſhip, and propoſed ſomething to be done by me with reference to the Liturgy, which (as I thought) in my then preſent circumſtances, having neither call nor neceſſity to do, I humbly craved leave of his Lordſhip to be excuſed therein; and ſpeaking yet further, about the ſtrict and hard terms of Conformity, his Lordſhip replied, *I confeſs I ſhould ſcarcely do ſo much for the Bible, as they require for the Common-Prayer.* Both theſe, I aſſure you, are great and learned Noble-men, and as far from being *Presbyterians* as your ſelf; yet you may ſee their Reſentments, as to what was commanded, how little they were pleaſed with ſuch high and rigorous proceedings, and how in the bottom of their hearts, they were rather the Advocates, than the Accuſers of the Non-conſenters: Yea, I perſwade my ſelf, that many among your ſelves had ſcruples more than a few, or eaſie, and would then with all their hearts have declined the *Teſt of aſſent and conſent*, if by any other means they could have eſcaped the danger: it is well for them

them if they tentured not their Conſciences, while they tendered their worldly intereſts and neceſſities; but to chuſe to do it from any free act of their own option and will, as what was deſired and delighted in by them (ſetting aſide ſome high Prelatical Churchmen, who returned in anger and meditated retaliation) was not to be found in the Boſom of many; yet even theſe are called forth to *declare their unfeigned aſſent and conſent*, &c. than which words, I know none more ſignificant of heart and good will, of love and choice, as to all and every thing contained in and preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer. For I pray, Sir, were you to expreſs your judgment and affection in any matter, and how your whole ſoul and mind is fully pleaſed, ſatisfied, and gratified therein, and this beyond all demur and exception; how could you more clearly diſcover your λόγον ἐνδιάθετον, than by the λόγον προφορικὸν of *an unfeigned aſſent and conſent unto it*? for mine own part, I profeſs I know not: Therefore it is well remarked by you, *that aſſent and conſent, and approve*, are words ſynonymous. But you ſay, *Cannot we approve of the uſe of a Book, or approve of a Book, as lawful to be uſed, as well as aſſent and conſent to the uſe of it?* Yes ſurely: But you miſtake me, for I neither *can aſſent nor conſent, nor approve of the Book, or the uſe of the Book*, ſo as hereby to witneſs mine own will or deſire for the ſame; yet I can uſe it in ſubmiſſion to Command, if I ſhall judge it not ſimply unlawful and ſinful to do it: I can, as I have ſaid, ſilently and patiently ſwallow down ſome Gnats, if my Superiours will have it ſo; but if I ſhall be required to ſay, *I aſſent and conſent, and approve of ſwallowing down Gnats*, this alters the caſe; and now I can no more ſwallow them down, than if they were *Camels*. Wherefore, *eo nomine*, upon the very ſame account, as you ingenuouſly confeſs, *you would be a Non-conformiſt to any Church in the world*, I am at this preſent to the Church of *England*. And upon the ſame ſcore I think preſent Conformity harder than formerly, the now Declaration being much more comprehenſive in its own nature, and taking in much more of our mind, will, and approbation, as to all and every thing recounted and ſpecified therein, than any foregoing ſubſcription; eſpecially than that mentioned by your ſelf in the time of Queen *Elizabeth*, wherein the Clergy were only required to ſubſcribe this promiſe; *I ſhall*

p. 9. l. 3.

p. 9. l. 5, 6, 7.

p. 3. l. 20.

read

read the Service appointed plainly, diſtinctly, and audibly, that all people may hear and underſtand. As for the Articles publiſhed by the Authority of King *Edward* the VI. and particularly that concerning the Book of Common-Prayer, with ſubſcription thereunto, I have not ſeen them, except in your Quotation, and therefore can ſay nothing in the caſe, one way or other: but I have two Books of Common-Prayer printed in his days, the firſt about the middle, the ſecond in the laſt year of his Reign; in neither of which is to be found *any Rubrick aſſerting the certainty of Childrens undoubted Salvation out of Gods Word, though they are baptized and die before actual ſins*; there is not, I ſay, one ſyllable to the ſaid purpoſe in either of them. Even this very particular would have rendred Subſcription more facile and paſſable to me, had I lived in thoſe days. As for the ſubſcription of the three Articles in the time of King *James*, I acknowledge this was one, *Quod Liber Publicæ Liturgiæ, &c. That the Book of Common-Prayer contains in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, &c.* Unto which I had rather, and ſhould much ſooner *ſubſcribe*, than declare *my unfeigned aſſent and conſent* (ſuppoſing the ſame Book of Common-Prayer) *to all and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by it.* For though I cannot prove ſuch and ſuch things to be abſolutely contrary to, or againſt Gods Word, yet I cannot therefore preſently affirm them to be according to Gods Word, either as expreſly revealed, or poſitively commanded by the Sacred Canon; which yet I muſt be able to do, before I can declare *my unfeigned aſſent and conſent* to the ſaid particulars; elſe I ſhould ſtrangely violate my Conſcience, and blindly ruſh forward at all adventures, without all reaſon or judgment. As for example, though I cannot ſay concerning Children baptized, and dying before actual ſin, *that their undoubted Salvation is abſolutely contrary to the Word of God*; yet never the more can I affirm, *that their undoubted Salvation is certain and expreſs by the ſame.* Therefore though perhaps I might ſubſcribe to the former, yet I could not declare my unfeigned aſſent and conſent to the latter.

p. 5. l. 2.

1549. 1552.

One thing I take notice of in theſe Subſcriptions, and I wiſh you would alſo for your better information; *viz.* That *aſſent and conſent, relate unto the acknowledgment or avouching the truth and goodneſs of the things aſſented and conſented to*, as well as to the uſe

The Great Ends generally mentioned for theſe Declarations and Subſcriptions, are *Unity and Uniformity* in the matters of Religion and Worſhip; whereas the contrary effects of *animoſity and difference* have wofully followed hereupon, time after time, as we have ſeen by long and ſad experience in continual breaches and diſſentions. There is, and will be, a *judicium diſcretionis* in every perſon, who will be a Judge in his own concern *contra Gentes*; his own mind and apprehenſion ſhall and will dictate to him what is right, and what is wrong, what is good, and what evil, both to be believed and practiſed by him; the greateſt Authority of his Superiours, and the wiſeſt Models of their deviſed forms for his devotion, in any wiſe notwithſtanding; nothing ſhall be able further to ſubjugate his thoughts to any Idea or Syſtem of Service, than to what may be truly ſaid to be his own, I mean according to his own underſtanding; and therefore much leſs to an oneneſs and ſameneſs of opinion and judgment of it with thoſe that are above him (though commending and commanding it to be received and obſerved) meerly becauſe they are ſo. Wherefore as it is the wiſdome of the Church to chuſe ſuch a Creed, as all who ſtile themſelves Chriſtians do univerſally agree in; ſo likewiſe it would be the higheſt prudence, to pitch upon ſuch a Declaration which all Miniſters might ſecurely and freely *aſſent and conſent unto*, without all ſcruple or heſitation, as the Teſt of their Conformity. I will not preſume to mention the nature and quality of ſuch an one; but ſhall leave it wholly to my Superiours and Betters: And let theſe, in Gods Name, enjoyn all Miniſters both *to declare and do* whatſoever the Word of God requires of them, to capacitate them for Church-work, and no more; then ſhould I expect Unity and Uniformity in all things of moment, with a peaceable toleration and forbearance in the reſt, to the glory of God, and the greateſt edification of the Church, and never be-

fore: Then alſo I would be among the firſt, who would humbly offer my ſelf as a Candidate to that high and holy Function, though in the meaneſt and pooreſt place of preferment.

But it is high time to come to particulars: I cannot approve of the Order appointed for the reading of the Scriptures; my reaſon was, becauſe many Books of *Apocrypha* are commanded to be read for the Leſſons of the day, as the fabulous Legends of *Tobit* and his *Dog*, *Bell* and the *Dragon*, *&c.* while ſome Books of the Sacred Canon are wholly left out, *&c.*

This I perceive touches you to the quick; this is confidence
p. 9. l. 30. *and impudence*, this is matter of exclamation againſt our *inve-*
p. 11. l. 2. *nomed tongues* and pens, and againſt our perſons as *Phariſaical*
l. 15. *Schiſmaticks*, and what not? I ſee your zeal for *Apocrypha* will
p. 13. l. 11. cauſe you preſently to fly on the faces of thoſe who ſhall dare to ſpeak a word in any diminution or derogation of it, and this only too as it Rivals the Holy Canon: Yet ſay what you can in the juſtification of *Apocrypha* (how the ſtories therein were received
p. 10. by many of the *Ancient Fathers for truth and reality*, and how
l. 23. (ſuppoſing them fiction and fancy) *profitable they are for inſtruction*, *comfort*, *reproof*, *as the Parables of Chriſt himſelf*; (ſo many
p. 10. l. 33. ſay, they can profit as much at a Play, as at a Sermon) yet *Apocrypha* is *Apocrypha* ſtill, and thoſe very Books appointed ro be read, full of abſurdities and impoſſibilities, as I could eaſily demonſtrate in ſeveral notorious circumſtances; but this would be *actum agere*, ſince it hath been ſufficiently manifeſted by many *Proteſtant* Pens againſt the *Papiſts*; here therefore I ſhall leave you to be cenſured andchaſtiſed of all, who are not of the *red Letter*, or looking thatway: As for mine own part, I ran over the Kalender, and ſawthere one whole Month together, *viz. October*, filled

filled with *Apocryphal* Books, Forenoon and Afternoon, appointed for the Leſſons of the day; the ſame likewiſe in *November*, unto the twenty fourth day of it, beſides what went before in *September* of the ſame kind, while ſome Books Canonical are wholly left out, which I did not approve of; neither can I find any thing of better information from your ſelf to change my mind: and the rather, becauſe I am fully perſwaded ſome parts of Scripture are omitted and ſhut out, which contain in them more to the profit and edification of the Hearers, than all the Books of *Apocrypha* put together; yea, it were little leſs than a Blaſphemy to ſay and think otherwiſe: Let us not preſume to be wiſer than God. But you ſay, *Nothing of* Apocrypha *is appointed for Sundays*; who ever laid this to your charge? Yet if you ſpeak truth, then ſome of your Miniſters are not well skill'd in the order of reading, who, as I am told by Ear-witneſſes, do ſometimes on Sundays read out of *Apocrypha*; whether they then read according to the common Monthly Kalender, and not according to the proper Leſſons appointed for Sundays, or whether they ſo read when an Holy-day, whoſe proper Leſſon is out of *Apocrypha*, falls to be on a Sunday, when there is proper againſt proper, and the Miniſter left at diſcretion which of the propers he will chuſe; I ſhall not trouble my ſelf about it, but leave it in *medio*, to the wiſe and learned in the caſe. You ſay *in our Conventicles we read little of Scripture*; indeed too little! *Pudet hæc opprobria nobis*, and wiſh it were otherwiſe with all mine heart; for I am as far from *aſſenting and conſenting to any ſuch omiſſion and neglect, as I would be to all and every thing contained in, and commanded by the Book of Common-Prayer*: Should I be required to give my approbation of this fault, or elſe could not be admitted into Society with them, I would rather bear their Excommunication, and like an Hermit ſerve God in the Wilderneſs by my ſelf alone, than joyn my ſelf to them. So vaſt a difference there is between being in Communion where faults are (for what Church is free from them?) and owning thoſe faults; yea, making ſuch an owning and approbation the *Lydius lapis*, whether we are fit for Communion yea or not. Now this is the very caſe of poor *Non-Conformiſts*, with thoſe who have outed them. But to return, Recrimination is no Self-juſtification: beſides, in moſt of our Meetings, there is on

p. 9. l. 29.

p. 9. l. penult.

Lords-days, at leaſt, conſtant reading of the Scripture, beſides the Expoſition, and giving of the ſenſe of it, with much care and pains, to the edification of the Hearers.

I cannot approve of the Order appointed for the Miniſtration of Baptiſm, becauſe of the *ſtrict requiring of Godfathers and Godmothers to ſtand as bounden* Sureties and Undertakers for the Child, *viz.* that he ſhall renounce the Devil, and all his Works, *&c.* You ſay, *Godfathers and Godmothers are not ſo ſtrictly required as to make it eſſential to the nature of Baptiſm, as is evident in private Baptiſm, which is declared valid without it.* I never objected any ſuch eſſential ſtrictneſs; this therefore is meer impertinency: Yet reading over the Miniſtration of private Baptiſm, as it is appointed to be further and fully compleated by the Miniſter, there I find Godfathers and Godmothers interrogated, and fully ingaging on the Childs behalf, as well as in publick. But ſuppoſe Godfathers and Godmothers are not called upon in private Baptiſm to make ſuch a promiſe; this is only in a rare extraordinary caſe of extremity, and out of the general uſual road: we know ſome others, in the like exigency, will grant a greater liberty; ſo much do they attribute to the *Opus Operatum*, that they will give leave to the Midwife to baptize, rather than fail: One Swallow makes no Summer. Herein alſo you run from the matter in hand. I ſay, Godfathers and Godmothers are uſually brought to the Font to avouch a great untruth; for though they make ſuch a ſolemn promiſe on the Childs behalf, they ſeldome perform it. This you fully *acknowledge paſt contradiction*, but charge it as a fault upon the Godfathers and Godmothers, and not *at all upon the Conſtitution*; yea, you highly applaud *the prudence and piety* of the Church in taking *ſuch a care for the vertuous education of the Children baptized.* But *quo warranto*? who hath authorized the Church to lay ſuch a charge upon any, beſides the Parents upon whom God has laid it? and if upon any, why upon thoſe who are called Godfathers and Godmothers, rather than upon others of the Congregation, who are all eye-witneſſes of the baptizing of the Child, as well as they? As we may not make more ſins than God has made ſins, ſo neither more duties than God has made duties: why therefore in particular ſhould we impoſe the duty on Godfathers and Godmothers, to look to the well education

of

of the Child baptized, when God has not impoſed it? eſpecially we may not do it, where the fulfilling this duty is an utter impoſſibility, as ſometimes it falls out in the matter before us. Sometimes perſons are Sureties for Children by their Proxies, themſelves living in another Country; how can theſe ſee the *ſaid Children vertuouſly brought up*, when they never ſee them? Sometimes Boys and Girls ſtand as Godfathers and Godmothers for the Infant at the Font; theſe are very likely to make good their promiſe, when they are ſcarce in a capacity to underſtand what they ſay; ſo far are they from a right apprehenſion of the matter they ingage in: Whereby it appears, that the great care of the Church for the health and ſafety of thoſe ſhe receives into her Boſom, (which is ſo much ſpoken of, and magnified) is no more than a meer pretence, and dwindles into a ſorry ſhadow of words and names: For if there was ſuch a true and real care as is given out, and vaunted, why will ye, the Miniſters, admit of any ſuch, as I have now mentioned, to be Godfathers and Godmothers? ye except againſt none, that I hear of. And why will you lay a charge upon theſe, of doing what in reaſon ye cannot but be convinced they are not in a condition to perform? Verily, if a man ſhould judge according to your Quotidian practice, I ſhould be prone to believe, ye your ſelves ſcarce think it an abſolute neceſſity, for Godfathers and Godmothers to perform their Font-promiſes; for ſetting aſide only what is there barely read before them, I never met with any Book, Sermon, or Diſcourſe, wherein the duty of Godfathers and Godmothers is preſſed upon them, with reference to their God-children, nor any thing to mind them of their Obligation, or move them to the fulfilling of it: Who therefore can imagine ye think it much material, further than the Pomp and Ceremony of their appearing, whether ſuch Godfathers and Godmothers look to the good manners of the Children baptized, yea or not? If men and women were throughly convinced by the Word of God, what great Bonds they lye under by being Godfathers and Godmothers, according to their own oral proteſtation, and form of ſpeech there dictated to their hands, notwithſtanding what you ſpeak *of the eaſineſs of the performance of the promiſe*, it would be hard to find out ſuch voluntary Stipulators, or collateral ſecurity in the caſe; but the Miniſter and his Clerk

p. 15. l. 1, 2.

ſhould

ſhould be neceſſitated to undertake that Province from time to time.

Again, I approve not of the Order appointed for the Miniſtration of Baptiſm, *becauſe the Father of the Child is left out, not mentioned and taken notice of at all* in the publick Stipulation, as if he had no concern in it, though it is his proper place to undertake this charge for his own Child, according to the Law of
p. 14. l. 4, 5. God and Nature. *with the higheſt ſcorn you juſtifie this way*, by the ſimilitude of a Debtor, and Sureties bound with him for an hundred pounds: But I never yet ſaw ſuch a Bond, where the Principal, and indeed the ſole Debtor, is not expreſly, and in the firſt place named; for if he be not expreſly named, how can any notice at all be taken, that the Money was lent unto him, *which is*,
p. 14. l. 8 as you know, *your own conceſſion*? yea, if he be not expreſly named as a Debtor, in point of Law, he has nothing to do with the Bond, or the Bond with him; which yet is the thing you would expoſe me for. Your compariſon affects me not, nor makes againſt me, but rather on my ſide: For let the Father be the chief Debtor to bring up his own Child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and ſome of his Friends (I mean Godfathers and Godmothers) be Sureties with him, that this Debt ſhall faithfully be paid and diſcharged; ſhall not this Chief, and indeed ſole Debtor, be called upon, and that too in the firſt place, to pay his Debt? In right reaſon he ſhould; and you your ſelf would be of the ſame mind, were you in ſome great Bond only Collateral Security to a Friend, and this too in little more than a Complement. Now therefore that the Principal and ſole Debtor is not once mentioned or called upon for the payment of the Debt, but only the Collaterals; this is my Exception, and I think not without cauſe. But you ſay,
p. 14. l. 13. *Nature and Religion call upon the Principal Debtor*, viz. *the Father of the Child, and that is ſufficient, without any further Call from the Miniſter.* I know what you would reply in the caſe, but I am not ſo ſpirited. Nature and Religion call upon us to keep the Moral Law, or ten Commandments; and therefore the Miniſters Call to keep them is needleſs, and out of doors. This is to make *compoſita* to be *oppoſita*: The more Obligations are upon us from Religion and Nature to fulfill any duty, the more we are to be called upon by Arguments out of thoſe Topicks

picks to perform the ſame, and all little enough: If not always Nature, yet always Religion does bind Godfathers and Godmothers *qua tales* to perform the promiſe made on the behalf of the Child baptized, for if it be not from Religion, there can be no tye in the caſe; yet the Church thinks not Religion enough to bind them, without the further help of additional Exhortation: why therefore ſhould not the ſame be thought neceſſary to the Father himſelf, to bind him alſo to his duty, notwithſtanding any preceding Obligation of Nature?

I approve not *of the Sign of the Croſs*, nor that Sacramental myſtical way of ſigning with this Sign, as if baptizing with Water in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, were not ſufficient; but moreover, the Sign of the Croſs needful, to bind the Conſcience, and confer the Bleſſing. You ſay, *The ſum of my Argument againſt ſigning with the Croſs is, because leſt by a perverſe interpretation it may ſeem to the vulgar people what it is not, and what I my ſelf dare not affirm it to be:* but herein you are either wilfully blind, or groſly in the dark; for though I mentioned my fear, leſt the action then done by the Miniſter (*for then the Prieſt ſhall make a Croſs upon the Childs Forehead*) and the words then uttered by him, (*We receive this Child into the Congregation of Chriſts Flock, and do ſign him with the ſign of the Croſs, in token that hereafter he ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt crucified, and manfully to fight under his Banner againſt Sin, the World, and the Devil, and to continue Chriſts faithful Souldier unto his lives end*) might be taken in a wrong ſenſe, and miſtaken by the generality, and do fear it ſtill; yet the preſumptuous addition of the Croſs to Baptiſm, and this too after the manner of another Sacrament, the deviſed Sacrament of man to the inſtituted Sacrament of God was the grand cauſe of my exception againſt it: for if we may add at our pleaſure *the Sign of the Croſs, why not alſo with ſome others Cream, Salt, and Spittle*; yea, whatſoever elſe the daring invention of man ſhall think meet to deviſe and conjoyn? Who, in this caſe, ſhall ſet the limits, and ſay, *Ne plus ultra*? As for mine own part, I would ſooner yield to have my Child baptized with Cream, Salt, and Spittle, yea, though Snow and Sope alſo were put into the Laver, than to have it ſigned with the Sign of the Croſs in ſuch a

p. 16. l. 23.

myſtical

myſtical manner. We are neither to add nor diminiſh in the matter of Gods Worſhip; and particularly this holds good in the Sacraments of the Goſpel, which in their own nature are Signs and Ceremonies; wherefore if we ſhall arrogate to our ſelves the licenſe of adding Sign to Sign, and Ceremony to Ceremony, in ſo doing we boldly ſet Threſhold againſt Threſhold, and proudly uſurp no leſs than the place and Dictatorſhip of God himſelf. This likewiſe more than faintly and covertly ſpeaks the Baptiſm of Water to *be lame, and wanting of it ſelf alone*; which *I have the*
p. 16. l. 10. *courage to ſpeak out in the hearing of all, according to your command*; yea, I promiſe you, if you will be at the charge to procure me one of Sir *Samuel Morelands Stentorean Tubes*, I will take the pains to go up to the Monument, and at the top of it I will trumpet it out as a truth all over the City; and if I could, I would cauſe it to ring and eccho from one end of the Nation to another: Why elſe is this dedicating ſign of the Croſs, at the time of the Infants Dedication, by waſhing in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, thought ſo neceſſary, and conſtantly co-applied? But you *have a Church-Canon* by you, mounted
p. 16. l. 16. and bent on purpoſe to diſcharge upon me, *prim'd with the Ru-*
l. 17. *brick*, and ready to give fire, upon all occaſions, with a loud contrary report: Well, be it ſo; yet after all, it is but *brutum fulmen*, I mean only *proteſtatio contra factum*, and therefore *ipſo facto* void, and of none effect. As if you ſhould vow and proteſt you were no Idolater, and yet at the ſame time worſhip a *Crucifix*, adore the Hoſt, or bow your knee to the Image of *Baal*. You indeed baptize the Child with Water in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and you ſay, *the Child ſo baptized, is lawfully and*
p. 16. l. 19. *ſufficiently baptized*; yet notwithſtanding, at the ſame time, *you ſign him with the ſign of the Croſs, in token hereafter he ſhall not be aſhamed to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt crucified, and manfully fight under his Banner againſt Sin, the World, and the Devil, &c.* Now this is the anſwer of a good Conſcience, and the main End and Obligation of Baptiſm, as to the party baptized, which the Croſs, and the ſigning him with that ſign (and not waſhing alone) muſt at leaſt mind him of, if not ſpirit him in, and ingage him to with the greateſt manhood and courage; elſe ſigning with the ſign of the Croſs is a meer inſignificancy, and a ridiculous

lous nothing. *Entia non ſunt multiplicanda ſine neceſſitate.* What need the Croſs, if waſhing with water could ſufficiently bring about its own ends? The Croſs therefore, as it is there uſed, loudly proclaims, waſhing of and by it ſelf incompleat, and imperfect.

Something was ſpoken further by me, *about laying aſide the uſe and cuſtom of ſigning with the ſign of the Croſs, to diſtinguiſh our ſelves from the Idolatrous Papiſts*, who ſuperſtitiouſly adore the Croſs, fooliſhly, fondly, and wickedly ſigning themſelves with it, upon every occaſion, putting no little confidence in it, to free them from evil, and to furniſh them with all good. But upon this ſcore, to leave off Croſſing, you call it *vanity and affectation, which is peculiar to the* Phariſees, *and ſome other people who are very like them.* I underſtand your Elegant Periphraſis, and the biting Sarcaſme in it: Oh how ſweet are your lips! Honey and Milk are under your tongue; yet what is the reaſon of all this rancour and bitterneſs? what is the cauſe ye cannot ſpeak peaceably of us, or to us? what is our deſert? what our provocation? are we not abaſed ſufficiently? have ye not all in poſſeſſion? do ye envy our being and breathing amongſt you? Death hath eaſed you of many of us already; and cannot you quietly expect a little longer, and we ſhall all retire, and trouble you no more? I grieve, and am ſad to ſee you of this ſpirit, but rejoyce and am glad my Soul is not under your power; for if it were, I might fear unplacable wrath, never to be appeaſed, would never forgive me, neither in this world, nor in the world to come. But to come to our buſineſs; you ſay, *I am much miſtaken in the temper of the Church of England*, (verily I am not at all miſtaken, for I ſee it evidently in her Children, the Sons of the Church, eſpecially if all be of your temper) *for the Church of* England *neither does any thing, nor leaves any thing undone, meerly for a note of diſtinction and ſeparation.* I know not what weight and ſtreſs you put upon the word *meerly*, or elſe as good a Church, and better than ever the Church of *England* was, notwithſtanding its Grandeur and Glory with the Pomp of that name, has (and that too by the counſel and command of infinite wiſdom and reaſon) upon the account of diſtinction and ſeparation from others, not more idolatrous and ſinful than the Papiſts in their worſhip, left off ſeveral Rites and Cu-

p. 17. l. 21.

p. 17. l. 18. l. 19.

l. 20.

ſtoms, not only ſinful and unlawful, (ſo ſome will dare to ſay of ſigning with the Croſs) but in themſelves otherwiſe innocent and harmleſs. I have a moſt unhappy memory, and cannot recover the name of the Author, a Chriſtian *Jew*, who apodictically, and moſt elaborately diſcovers, that many things were directed in their Law by God, both to be done and left undone by the Nation of the *Jews*, chiefly to diſuſe and take them off from the ways and practices of the *Gentiles* that were round about them. But let infallible truth be the judge in this matter, *Levit.* 18. 3. *After the doings of the Land of* Egypt, *wherein ye dwelt, ye ſhall not do; and after the doings of the Land of* Canaan, *whither I bring you, ſhall ye not do, neithet ſhall ye walk in their Ordinances.* Then *Moſes*, all along the Chapter, enumerates many of thoſe Heatheniſh doings, from which the people of God were moſt religiouſly to abſtain: but in the next Chapter following ſome other things are mentioned, which in themſelves abſolutely conſidered, were *neither ſinful nor unlawful*, yet upon the ſcore *of Non conformity*, were forbidden them, ver. 27. *Ye ſhall not round the corners of your Heads, neither ſhalt thou mar the corners of thy Beard.* But why? what evil in it? *Ainſworth* gives us the true reaſon of this Inhibition; This, ſaith he, is likely to be the manner of the Heathens, eſpecially in their mourning, as theſe Laws compared with, Chap. 21. v. 5. ſeem to imply; and he brings in the Authority of *Maimonides*, in theſe words, *It was the manner of Idolatrous Prieſts to mar their Beards; therefore the Law forbiddeth to mar the Beard.* So again, v. 28. *Ye ſhall not make any cuttings in your fleſh for the Dead, nor print any marks upon you.* The aforeſaid moſt Learned Expoſitor here again, out of the ſame *Maimonides*, informs us, what theſe prints or marks were; *viz. when one did cut open his fleſh, and filled the cut place with* Stibium, *or with Ink, or ſome other colour; and this was the cuſtom of the Heathens; and particularly this they were wont to do in ſorrow, and mourning for a Soul departed*, as it is in *Thargum Jonathan*; *Now from theſe, and other like Heatheniſh Rites, God will keep his people*; and therefore it is ſaid, *Ye ſhall not make any cuttings in your fleſh for the Dead.* I could eaſily produce much more to the ſame purpoſe, but I think it needleſs.

I excepted againſt what is annexed at the end of the Sacrament;

ment; *It is certain by Gods Word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved.* You ſay, *Had you a mind, you might wave the diſpute:* Surely it would be your prudence ſo to do; for though you affirm it *evidently to be the Doctrine of your Church, as appears from the Homilies, and ſeveral paſſages in the Office of Baptiſm it ſelf*; yet I apprehend it beyond the wiſdom and learning of all the Fathers and Sons of the Church together, to make good the Enunciation, eſpecially it being ſo indefinite and unlimited, concerning the Children baptized, without all reſtriction, and yet ſo poſitive and peremptory in the Predicate. I called for the *Ubi* out of Gods Word, *viz.* wherein I might be ſatisfied, beyond all doubt, of Chriſtened Childrens Salvation before actual ſin: You ſhould have deſigned the Holy Page; this had been a direct and eaſie way of Confutation, by which I muſt have been convinced and ſilenced, and there had been an end of the Conteſt: But I ſee you cannot bring your proof, nor indeed offer any thing like unto it out of Scripture; wherefore my Objection is juſt, and I ſuppoſe unanſwerable. Secret things belong unto the Lord; and ſurely the Salvation of Infants, even as of the Adult, is *inter arcana*, one of Gods Secrets: Why therefore ſhould any preſume to intermeddle with it, and confidently pronounce concerning the whole Genus of ſuch a ſort of Infants, *that they are all undoubtedly ſaved*? Though they are young, do they not make a number in computation? which if they do, certainly their number is great, very great, eſpecially if that Obſervation be true, that well nigh half of all born and Chriſtned among us, depart this life before they have committed actual ſin. Theſe are a ſwarming multitude; and yet ſhall all theſe undoubtedly be ſaved? Far be it from me to limit the grace and mercy of God; yet methinks, even from this conſideration, we have ſome ground of a contrary ſuſpition out of Gods Word, at leaſt of ſuſpending our judgment in the matter before us. *For though the number of the Children of* Iſrael *be as the ſand of the Sea, a Remnant ſhall be ſaved*; Rom. 9. 27. *There are few that are ſaved*; only a Remnant, a little end of the whole Piece; ſome few choice ones only among thoſe who are ſtiled the *Iſrael of God*, ſhall be thought worthy of eternal life. But I forbear to bring in any new Ob-

p. 17. l. 27. l. ult. p. 18. l.

jections, only give me leave to ask you this queſtion, How you can fairly wave this diſpute? how can you think it not incumbent upon you to *make good the Aſſertion, and juſtifie what you have aſſented and conſented unto*? You tell me upon what account, *Becauſe though it be contained in, yet it is not preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer; that is, it is never to be uſed; and we aſſent and conſent only to the uſe of thoſe things which are both contained in, and preſcribed by that Book.* This word *both*, thruſt in by your ſelf, as you imagine, gives you your *quietus eſt*. Hitherto I have taken you for a Divine, but now one would think you ſome cunning ſubtil Lawyer with your Tricks and Quirks; you have found out an unexpected Loop-hole to eſcape, and baffle your Bond, which hath loſt all force and vertue of Obligation in *ſenſu diviſo*, becauſe it only binds in *ſenſu compoſito*. Yet pardon me, Sir, for I muſt aſſume the liberty to keep this Yoke ſtill upon your Neck, ſhake it off how you can. But how? Thus; You dare not but acknowledge that the great and learned Sages of the Church, who compoſed and worded this Declaration, were *compotes mentis*, and underſtood what they did better than your ſelf, or any ſuch Expoſitor; and therefore had, as it hath been ſhewn already, when they put in theſe words, *aſſent and conſent*, into the ſaid Declaration, *credenda* as well as *agenda* in their thoughts and intentions, they had equally an eye to both theſe in the time of the compoſing it. Beſides what is there ſpoken for the clearing of this truth, I am now further confirmed in my Opinion by the two following Participles, *contained in, and preſcribed by*, which very naturally, and almoſt neceſſarily, anſwer the foregoing Subſtantives *Aſſent and Conſent*, to ſuch an end and purpoſe; as thus, *I declare my unfeigned aſſent to all and every thing (as truth and right to be believed) which is contained in the Book of Common-Prayer: and I declare my unfeigned conſent to all and every thing (as good and eligible to be practiſed and obſerved) which is preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer.* Here is Grammar and ſenſe, and I ſuppoſe the very ſenſe intended by the Lawmakers. Surely they well weighed every ſeveral and diſtinct word in ſuch a ſet and ſolemn Proteſtation; and therefore every ſeveral diſtinct word in it, hath its ſeveral diſtinct weight and purpoſe; for far be it from me to charge ſuch conſiderate Com-

17. 29, 30, 1.

poſers

poſers as guilty of any *Tautology*, much leſs of *Battology*; unto which you will cauſe them to approach too near, if *aſſent and conſent, unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained and preſcribed in and by the Book, &c.* do refer to, and terminate *upon uſe and practice only*, without any further aim; then it had been fully enough to ſay, *I declare my unfeigned conſent to all and every thing preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer*, and no need at all either of the word *aſſent*, or of the word *contained in*, to be once mentioned or thought upon. You therefore deſerve a rebuke from your Superiours for your preſumptuous intruſion; who made you of their counſel? why ſhould you leave out, or put in any thing without their Commiſſion? why ſhould you inſert the word *uſe*, which they never inſerted? But then you go further; for having inſerted the word *uſe*, you ſay confidently enough, *that aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by*, centre wholly upon the word *uſe*, and have no other matter to reſpect; and then again from hence you think you have gained another point (*conceſſo uno abſurdo, &c.*) of freeing your ſelf from the difficulty and preſſing force of the Exception againſt Chriſtned Infants, their certain and undoubted Salvation, dying without actual ſin, by ſaying, *You are not bound to give aſſent and conſent to this Rubrick; becauſe though it be contained in, yet it is not preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer, that is, it is never to be uſed*; and *we aſſent and conſent only to the uſe of thoſe things which are both contained in, and preſcribed by that Book.* p. 17. l. 30.

But this is a deep fetch, and a fine ſubtilty of your own, never to be allowed: What think you of the Church Catechiſm, wherein we have a Compendium of the Churches Faith? what does not the Declaration bind you to believe it your ſelf, as well as to teach it the Children? what think you of the Creed? does the Declaration only bind you to rehearſe the Articles of it before the Congregation, and not believe them your ſelf? Surely to the latter, as well as the former: Every Collect, every Prayer has in it a *Credendum*, as well as an *Orandum*; and without the firſt the laſt cannot be performed, ſince Faith is of the very eſſence of Prayer, properly ſo called? But what do you imagine, the Declaration binds the Miniſter only to ſay over thoſe Prayers, and not to pray them, or pray in them? that is, not to believe what he

prays

prays for to be right, and according to Gods holy will and pleaſure? This ſeems to me highly Paradox, and of a moſt dangerous conſequence. Grant you this Poſtulate, and you ſpoil the whole Declaration, as to the great intents and purpoſes of it; for who may not declare in theſe words, *I aſſent and conſent to all and every thing, &c.* if nothing of belief, but only uſe and ſubmiſſion be intended by them? I have heard of ſome *Jews*, continuing ſuch, without any change of their Religion, officiating as Prieſts among the *Papiſts*, and Celebrating *Maſs*; now why may not ſuch *Jews*, yea *Turks* alſo, thruſt in among our Clergy, if by declaring their *unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained and preſcribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer*, they ſignifie no more, than that they will *read over thoſe Prayers, perform thoſe Offices and Ceremonies, and ſubmit to the uſe and doing of every thing enjoyned*; but in the interim, without being obliged at all to believe the things ſo *contained in, and preſcribed by the Book, and ſo ſaid and done by them*, to be right, good, and juſtifiable? They may act as upon a Stage for a livelihood, and have no concern about the thing acted, or whom they perſonate: Therefore Sir, I tell you again, you cannot wave the diſpute, but are bound to *believe*, as well as *to do all and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer, and to believe this in particular, concerning the undoubted Salvation of Children baptized, and dying before actual ſin*; and this too as a *truth aſſerted plainly and evidently out of Gods Word, paſt all cavil, or gain ſaying*. Wherefore I humbly and earneſtly entreat you, as a moſt learned Textuary, to quote the place, and ſatisfie my ſcruple; for until then, I dare not declare my unfeigned *aſſent and conſent unto ſuch a doubtful and queſtioned Propoſition contained in the Book*. But you would know of me, *whether nothing be*
p. 18. l. 8. *undoubtedly certain by Scripture, but what we have an expreſs Text for*? Yes, many things are undoubtedly certain by Scripture, not only in *terminis expreſſis* but alſo by an undeniable conſequence: wherefore let what is aſſerted concerning the *undoubted Salvation of ſuch Infants*, be confirmed and demonſtrated out of Gods Word, in the *true ſenſe and meaning* of it, or by any *certain and neceſſary Inference and Reaſon from it*, and our buſineſs is at an end. This therefore you attempt as it were Syllogiſtically.

If

If thoſe who are regularly admitted into the Church of Chriſt, p. 18.
have a right to the bleſſings of the Covenant, *then they have a Ti-* l. 13.
tle to Salvation.

I anſwer, There is no ſuch word in the Rubrick *as regularly admitted*; which makes me wonder at your confidence, to add what you pleaſe, from time to time, to ſerve your turn. 'Tis an hard queſtion, whether all Children in *England* be regularly admitted (as you may expound the words) by Baptiſm into the Church, yea or not? I cannot divine what are your thoughts in the caſe, nor what an Avenue and Start-hole you would find *from regularly admitted*, rather than be ſet up, and Mated. There is a great ambiguity in the word *regularly admitted*, which muſt be aſcertained: wherefore we muſt ſuppoſe all Infants baptized in the Church of *England*, according to the Liturgy, *are regularly admitted* into the Church of Chriſt, for the Rubrick intends at leaſt all of them; yea, it ſpeaks of Children indefinitely: *wherefore if theſe being regularly admitted* (as we ſuppoſe they are) *into the Church of Chriſt, have a right unto the bleſſings of the* Covenant, *then they have a Title to Salvation.* I anſwer, If by having a right to the bleſſings of the Covenant, you mean *all the bleſſings of the* Covenant, even to the ultimate and great bleſſing of all, *viz. Salvation*, then there is *Petitio Principii* not to be granted, until it be proved, as being the Bone of Contention: But if by having a right to the bleſſings of the Covenant, you mean *ſome bleſſings of the* Covenant, I ſhall readily concede; for even their admiſſion into the Church, as viſible Church-Members, is a great Covenant-bleſſing, immediately inveſting them with the *actual privileдge of having God for their God, in a more peculiar manner*, than thoſe without the Pale; beſides, with a foundation right of enjoying the Oracles, Ordinances, Communion of Saints, *&c.* Their admiſſion into the Church by Baptiſm, gives them from that time forward *jus in re*, though not *jus ad rem*, by reaſon of their preſent incapacity.

But you further argue; *If they have not a right to the bleſſings* p. 18.
of the Covenant, *through a regular admiſſion into the Church by* l. 15.
Baptiſm, then Baptiſm is an inſignificant Ceremony, and not the Seal of the Covenant. I anſwer, They have many bleſſings of the Covenant (as I have now ſhown) though yet they may fall ſhort of

of the greateſt of all; and therefore Baptiſm notwithſtanding is not an inſignificant Ceremony, but a Seal of the Covenant. Shortly, Baptiſm ſupplied the room of Circumciſion, which was a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith; yet we cannot avouch, that all who were *regularly circumciſed*, ſhould have been *undoubtedly ſaved*, had they died in their Infancy; for *Eſau* was Circumciſed as well as *Jacob*, concerning whom, without all reſpect either of their doing good or evil, that the Purpoſe of God might ſtand according to Election, it is written, Jacob *have I loved, and* Eſau *have I hated: Eſau* was hated both before and after Circumciſion; which therefore could never have been his ſure Convoy to happineſs, had he immediately expired upon the receiving of this Seal: Salvation depends upon Election, and not at all upon our ſooner or later dying after we are baptized. Theſe are your Arguments, unto which I will not ſay with a juſt return in your own Dialect, *The man is mad, and raving*, but his Logick is weak, and will not do the work: Yet it may be from your civility and good nature thus to mollifie and lenefie your hard ſpeeches with ſoft arguments: In the interim, we are now ſtill under the *ſame doubt, about the undoubted Salvation of Chriſtned* Infants *dying before actual ſin*, as we were in the beginning, and ſo ſhall continue, until we ſee better reaſons to the contrary; and therefore cannot *aſſent and conſent*.

p. 19. l. 14. l. 23.

My following Queries are neither captious nor impertinent, but natural and appoſite, if we look upon the words of the Rubrick, as conſidered in themſelves; viz. *It is certain by Gods Word, that Children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved*; for here is the *Opus Operatum, Children baptized*, and dying before actual ſin; here is the effect, at leaſt, the ſure conſequent of it, ſuch are *undoubtedly ſaved*; here is nothing mentioned concerning the *Modus*, how and in what manner the work is or ought to be done to produce ſuch an effect, or ſore-ſignifie ſuch a Conſequent. Now therefore, if ſuch a Conſequent do neceſſarily follow after ſuch a Cauſe; then if it be in the power of Man to be ſuch a Cauſe (as to kill a poor Infant preſently after Baptiſm) it will be in his power alſo to bring about ſuch an effect, *viz.* the Salvation of ſuch an Infant. But you ſay, *Regularly admitted by Baptiſm, which the Church of* England

p. 18. l. 20.

land *ſuppoſes, anſwers moſt of my captious Queries.* I anſwer, Let me have liberty to put in and out, and ſuppoſe what I pleaſe in all caſes, (as you do from time to time) and I will, *nullo negotio*, untye every *Gordian* Knot; I will affirm or deny any Propoſition, be it in it ſelf true or falſe, right or wrong, without any ſcruple or heſitation; no Prieſt or Jeſuite ſhall be able to out-do me. How know you that the Church ſuppoſeth theſe words, *Regularly admitted by Baptiſm*? Why ſhould you preſume to ſet ſuch limits, to put ſuch a cloſe Hedge about the Rubrick, when it lies open, and in common? But if you will thus incroach preſumptuouſly from your own head and heart, why am I bound to give credit unto you? or govern my Faith and Practice by your private Sentiments? Yet I wiſh theſe words, *Regularly admitted by Baptiſm*, had been expreſſed in the Rubrick; which perhaps might have ſaved me the trouble of objecting, and ſo you of confuting. But granting the truth of the Rubrick in its latitude; I ſaid, 'That a Miniſter would be very cruel and unmerciful, to deny a-'ny Children their Chriſtendom, though their Parents out of 'weakneſs or tenderneſs of Conſcience ſcrupled Godfathers and 'Godmothers, and the Sign of the Croſs, and durſt not upon 'that ſcore bring their Children to be baptized; yet, *as I added*, 'if he were a true Son of the Church, and punctually obſerved 'his preſcribed Rule, he muſt not baptize any Infant without 'Godfathers and Godmothers, without ſigning of it with the 'Sign of the Croſs, whether it be ſaved or damned. Here you ſay, *I am a man of Conſcience*, that is of no Conſcience at all, *p. 20. l. 6.* of a *tender Conſcience*, that is cauteriz'd: But why? for bringing in ſuch a falſe and unjuſt Charge againſt the practice of the Church of *England*; which, as 'plainly appeareth in the form of *p. 20.* 'private Baptiſm, has expreſly ordered her Miniſters to baptize *l. 11.* 'Children without Godfathers and Godmothers, or the Sign of *p. 21. l. 19.* 'the Croſs: You know not what remark to make on this, but 'leave it to my ſelf, and every impartial Reader, to think on it. Though you do not know what Remark to make on my Objecti-on, yet I know what Remarks to make on your Confutation; for plainly, I obſerve in it falſeneſs, and weakneſs: Firſt, there is a great untruth in it; for though you ſay, 'The 'Church of *England* has expreſly ordered (in that private form

'of baptizing) to baptize Children without Godfathers and 'Godmothers, or the Sign of the Croſs; *yet there is no ſuch thing* 'expreſſed or mentioned in the Order, but at the uttermoſt it is only ſuppoſed by a Mute; and will you call ſilence expreſſion? Here I leave you to your ſelf, and ſerious thoughts; ſo likewiſe to the thoughts of the impartial Reader, how far you can ſtretch to bring in an Accuſation. If the Miniſter in private Baptiſm ſhould ſign the Infant baptized with the Sign of the Croſs, would he croſs the intent of that ſilent (which you call expreſs) Order, yea or not? I believe nothing at all; which to do, had it been an expreſſed or declared Order, would have been a manifeſt violation of the ſame: And then as to Godfathers and Godmothers, they are both mentioned, and interrogated, and as clearly brought in for the Conſummation of private Baptiſm, as in publick. Secondly, There is a great weakneſs in your Confutation; for my Objection lies againſt the manner of baptizing in ordinary, and you anſwer me from the manner of baptizing in extraordinary, *as in caſe of any apparent danger of death.* What? can only Parents (whoſe Children are in danger of death) have theſe ſcruples, mentioned by me, againſt Godfathers and Godmothers, and againſt the Sign of the Croſs, and not multitudes beſides them? How ſhall the Children of theſe, *how ſcrupulous ſoever they be,* (as you avouch they may) come to their Chriſtendom? What ſhall theſe, whether theſe Children be in imminent peril of death, yea or not, come with a lye in their mouths to the Miniſter, and ſay, 'Pray, Sir, baptize our Children according to the private or- 'der of Baptiſm, for they are ready to die, though they are not? Well, he comes, and on the contrary ſees their Children ſtrong and well; ought he now to baptize them according to the private or publick form? Surely according to the publick, becauſe the pretended neceſſity of the private is found a falſity: Here *ergo* the ſcrupulous Parents are at the ſame Bar as at the beginning, and their Children as far from being baptized as ever; and this too becauſe the Miniſter *will not*, and, *according to order, ought not to baptize their Children without Godfathers and Godmothers, and the Sign of the Croſs.*

p. 20. l. 14.

p. 20. l. 15.

Now what I have here ſpoken is not an idle Suppoſition, and meer Imagination, but I have reaſon to believe it a real truth, in matte

matter of fact; for I know the Perſon very well, who has again and again been deſired by Parents to baptize their Children, and being unwilling and averſe to intermeddle in that affair, hath ſincerely counſelled the ſaid Parents to have a recourſe to their own Pariſh-Miniſter to do it for them, whoſe proper office it was: but they have replied, 'He will not baptize our Children without 'Godfathers and Godmothers, and we know not where to get 'them.

My laſt ſcruple was againſt the Order and Office for the Burial of the Dead; wherein we have as much ſaid, as can well be ſignified and expreſſed by word or tongue, concerning the moſt certain ſalvation and happineſs of every one buried by the Miniſter, though of the worſt of men, though of the moſt flagitious and facinorous perſons, ſo living, and ſo dying. What think you of S. *Coleman* the Traytor? I am aſſured from an Eye and Ear-witneſs, that he was buried in S. *Giles*'s Church-yard by one of the Readers, and by the Common-Prayer Book; and ſo perhaps were the reſt, not of the Loyal, but Liolan and lying Saints after him: At every ſuch Interment, the Miniſter ſaith, 'Foraſmuch 'as it hath pleaſed God of his great mercy, to take unto himſelf 'the Soul of our dear Brother here departed, *&c.* What can more plainly ſignifie the ſafety and bliſs of ſuch a Soul? what can more fully declare the love and favour of God towards it, and place it in Heaven? You ſay, 'It is no more than that of *Solo-* p. 21. 'mon in the *Eccleſiaſtes*, Chap. 12. 7. Then ſhall the duſt return to l. 14. 'the Earth as it was, and the Spirit ſhall return unto God who 'gave it. But ſurely, in my judgment, *God his taking to himſelf (and this too in mercy, in great mercy) every ſuch particular ſoul*, (whoſe body is committed to the ground) ſounds and imports much more than *Solomon* intended, *by his returning of the Spirit unto God after death*; for the whole verſe is but a general deſcription of death, and to give us to underſtand, that after death the Body goes one way, and the Soul another; the Body to the Ground, and the Soul unto God; that is, ad *Deum Judicem*, unto God as unto a Judge, before whoſe dreadful Tribunal the Soul immediately after death ſhall be brought to appear, and there ſhall be ſentenced according to deſert, either to weal or woe, for ever and ever. This is quite another thing from *God his receiving*

of every Soul departed in great mercy to himself; which implies the happy and setled state and abode of such a Soul, in the place of Gods abode to all Eternity. You say, 'To return to God, and
. 21. 'to be taken to him, signifies to be put in the immediate disposal
. 19. 'of God; and for your Authority and Vouch, you quote one Mr. *Falkner*: I see by your often quotations of him, you securely rely upon him, as if he were an unerring Oracle, and an αὐτὸς ἔφη, an unanswerable demonstration; nevertheless I know not the man, nor ever yet set eye upon any of his learned Lucubrations; and therefore how truly or how falsly you have quoted, or perhaps transcribed him, I can neither affirm, or deny. I freely grant him to be a Reverend Person, of great Abilities, according as you have *reported* him; notwithstanding my Faith and Perswasion depend
. 21. not upon his sense and judgment, nor indeed of any mans else, though otherwise the most Renowned for Learning in the Age, but only upon the Infallible Truth of Gods Word; and therefore will follow him, and you also, as far as ye follow that, but no further. He saith, according to your quotation, 'Our Church ac-
. 21. 'knowledgeth to be an act of mercy in God, through the Grace
. 22. 'of Christ, who hath the Keys of Hell and Death, that dying 'persons do not forthwith go into the power of the Devil, who 'had the power of Death, but do immediately go into the hands 'of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, to be disposed 'of by him, according to the promises and conditions of the 'Gospel-Covenant, *&c.* These are his words: but can these be verified of every wicked and profligate Wretch buried by the Liturgy? Truth saith concerning such persons, 2 *Tim.* 2. 16. ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, that while they were alive (as the word imports) they were taken captive by the Devil: Who therefore can believe, that they made an escape from him, and got out of his Clutches by death, and not rather then fell under his power in a more fearful manner? The *Devil had*, and has still, *the power of Death*, in respect of all impenitent sinners, as the *Carnifex*, or Executioner, has power over those who are condemned to die; and accordingly put into his hands, that the Sentence may be actually fulfilled. But now are the Condemned ever known to escape from the Hangman, after he has Noosed them in the Halter, and actually trussed them up? I think not. So again, who

can

can believe that abominable wicked workers (againſt whom I make the objection) go immediately after death into the hands of the great God, to be diſpoſed of by him according to the promiſes of the Goſpel-Covenant; when the ſaid perſons had never the leaſt qualification of Grace and Holineſs to entitle them to the Covenant of Grace, or the promiſe of the Goſpel, but utterly the contrary? What therefore is this Harangue and flouriſh of words (were they not only uttered by Mr. *Falkner*, but alſo by an Angel) to ſatisfie my ſcruple, or give me a Licence when I am to bury the worſt and moſt vile amongſt men, to ſay, 'Forasmuch as it hath pleaſed God of his great mercy, to take unto 'himſelf the Soul of our dear Brother? Neither is there then place or ſeaſon to mention any thing of a *ſure and certain hope of the Reſurrection unto eternal life*, unleſs to imbolden wicked livers to continue ſtill in their ſins? much leſs to uſe any ſuch expreſſion in prayer, 'That when we ſhall depart this life, we may reſt in him '(*Chriſt*) as our hope is this our Brother doth. Alas! what well-grounded hopes can either Miniſter or people have and harbour of Drunkards, Whoremongers, Adulterers, curſed Swearers, and the like, their reſting in Chriſt, who every day are brought unto the ground, and buried by the Liturgy? You ſay, 'There are va- p. 22.
'rious degrees of hopes, and ſome of them ſo little, that we can l. 3.
'hardly deny them to any perſon, though never ſo wicked. I confeſs, in this particular, your Charity and Hope is much beyond mine, and yet I think mine is regulated according to the Goſpel.

But your fulleſt juſtification of your Church in this matter, is by ſuppoſing this Office of Burial to be performed only to *perſons dying in Communion with the Church*. I look upon it as the beſt Apology, and I have heard it again and again, yet it is not equal nor ſatisfactory; becauſe it ſuppoſeth, if not an impoſſibility, yet the greateſt improbability: For it is known upon matter of fact, that Excommunication was never duly exerciſed, nor Church-Diſcipline ever duly adminiſtred, nor indeed likely to be for the future; while in the interim multitudes, multitudes of ungodly men are brought to the ground, and there the laſt Office done unto them, as if they were the moſt Godly, and approved by the Church. The Church ſuppoſeth or maketh a Foundation which

is

is not, and then buildeth her practice upon it, againſt all right and ſeemlineſs: It is as if I certainly knowing ſuch and ſuch perſons to be really mad, and out of their wits by a long *Quotidian* experience, and yet from time to time would treat and converſe with them, as perſons moſt ſober and diſcreet, becauſe being men, it muſt be ſuppoſed that they have exerciſe of reaſon and underſtanding.

But rather than not juſtifie the Office for the Dead, and not to help out the defect of due Excommunication, you ſay, 'I doubt
p. 23. l. 14, 15. 'not but whoſoever ſhall leave out that ſentence, *as our hope is* '*this our Brother doth*, at the burial of ſome notorious profligate 'ſinners, complies with the intention of the Church, and may 'juſtifie himſelf to his Superiours for doing ſo. I anſwer, *Antiquum obtines*, you are *ſemper idem*, beginning and ending with the ſame mind, and in the ſame way. You can put in, and leave out, to ſerve a turn, according to your pleaſure, and yet not be a Tranſgreſſor, but *comply with the intention of the Church.* Surely there is no ſuch matter; for the Church hath expreſly ordered concerning the laſt prayers for the Office, whereof theſe words, *as our hope is this our Brother doth*, are a part, in this manner, *Then the Prieſt ſhall ſay*, ſhall ſay, that is, he muſt and ought to ſay them, and never omit them. Here the Miniſter is expreſly commanded, and much more, than to baptize without the Sign of the Croſs, as you could urge in the caſe of private Baptiſm, though moſt illogically, and moſt remotely from true reaſon, as far as a privative is from a poſitive, and a Non-entity from a Being. To conclude, if you do not when you bury the dead (though known beyond all peradventure to die in their ſins) uſe theſe very words, *as our hope is this our Brother doth*, you are a Tranſgreſſor againſt the Church, inaſmuch as you directly diſobey her expreſs order and rule, and you contradict your own Declaration, and little leſs than give the Lye to your own ſolemn Oath and Aſſeveration; for then and there you declared your *unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained and preſcribed in and by the Book, entituled, the Book of Common-Prayer; and therefore to all and every thing contained in and preſcribed by the ſaid Book for the Burial of the Dead*; which yet you like not, nor approve in ſuch and ſuch caſes that too often occur, as to ſuch and

ſuch

ſuch perſons, which are every day upon the Biere; but rather you think it right and meet to omit and skip them over, as not proper to be applied, not good to be mentioned. On the other ſide, if you uſe theſe words, *as our hope is this our Brother doth*, viz. *reſt in Chriſt*, at the Sepultures of the Sons of *Belial*, while you obey the Churches order, you are a tranſgreſſor againſt your own Conſcience, in uttering what you believe not; and a tranſgreſſor againſt God, in mentioning this your hope before him in your prayers, as if you had good ground and authority for it out of his holy Word, concerning the perſons deceaſed; when as in reality there is nothing in the Scriptures of Truth to intimate or countenance ſuch an hope, but altogether, on the contrary, to ſtrike a fear in our hearts of their moſt miſerable reſtleſs ſtate under eternal death and damnation.

Sir, What in your Concluſion you are pleaſed to ſtile the only *piece of ingenuity in me*, is ſtill my mind and judgment, and I do not retract from it in the leaſt, let it diſpleaſe whom it ſhall diſpleaſe, as I believe it will do many. And what you ſay, I acknowledge to be a great truth (whether properly and directly inferred from my Conceſſion, yea or not) viz. *That there is a real difference between that conformity which is requir'd of a Clergy man, and that which is required of a Lay-man.* You add further, *The uſe I would make of this acknowledgment is this, that whatever objections there may be againſt conforming as a Miniſter, there are none againſt conforming as a private Chriſtian; and therefore that nothing he hath ſaid ought to diſſwade private Chriſtians from conforming to the Church of* England, *by his own confeſſion.* I anſwer, Let the perſons concerned judge, and do according as God and a good Conſcience ſhall dictate unto them; but as for mine own part, were I one of them, I ſhould not cordially chuſe *and approve* of him to be my Shepherd, nor eaſily *aſſent and conſent* to ſit under his Paſtoral charge (if good Paſture might be found and had elſewhere) who entreth not by the door into the Sheepfold, but climbeth up ſome other way; eſpecially if this other way appeared to me to be too too like the way which *David* moſt devoutly prayed againſt, Pſal. 119. 29. *Remove from me the way of lying. Amen.* p. 23. l. 20.

THE

The Second Part.

AFter a Confutation in *Quarto*, another is brought to my hands in *Folio*: I have kill'd him for a Villain, ſaid he on the Stage, and made him an Example. What? have you kill'd him? *kill him again.* I was kill'd ſufficiently, as one would think, by my firſt *Antagoniſt*; notwithſtanding to make ſure work, another comes in with his deadly ſtab, and will needs kill me the ſecond time; and yet I find and feel a quite contrary effect, and even return into life by this renewed death; while the firſt of theſe, as it were, with a ſtrong puff of wind blows out my Candle, and the ſecond with a ſharper blows it in again, and my Candle burns ſtill as bright as ever: For comparing one Confutation with another, I am the better informed to anſwer them both, and continue more ſtedfaſtly the ſame, what I was, in my firſt opinion, inaſmuch as in ſeveral things mine Opponents are not more contrary to me, than contrary to themſelves, in what they write againſt me: though yet in their ſpirit and temper they are one, full of wrath, cenſure, and bitterneſs; a man that ſhall touch them muſt be fenced *with Iron, and the Staff of a Spear*, elſe they will pierce and gore intollerably. I have ſcuffled with the firſt as well as I could, and am now come to encounter the laſt.

Sir, Your Introduction is ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ, from the common place called, *Reviling and Reproaching*; and though it be particularly calculated for a Preface againſt me, yet it may indifferently ſerve as a general *Exordium* to any *Philippick* againſt the whole Tribe of the Non conformiſts in all Controverſies whatſoever. I have heard of one beholding a great pair of Gates to a very little City, ſaid facetiouſly to the Citizens, *Pray ſhut your Gates, leſt the City run out, and be loſt*; ſuch me thinks is your large beginning above the proportion of the following matter, it being more than a ſixth of the whole. O how copious and fluent are you in this kind

kind of Rhetorick! how is your Pen as the tongue of a ready Speaker! None, I dare ſay, about the Bridge can out-do you, or put you down; but I check my ſelf, for I have a better anſwer prepared to my hand, in which I ſhall acquieſce, *not rendring evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrariwiſe bleſſing.* I bleſs the Lord Jeſus that I am accounted worthy among my Brethren to ſuffer ſhame for his Name; and I pray God to bleſs you, in turning your heart from your cauſleſs prejudice and wrathful indignation againſt us. This is all I have to reply to your Premiſes, and now come to the work before us.

I could not declare *my aſſent and conſent, mine unfeigned aſſent and conſent* to all and every thing contained in and preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer. This, you ſay, *may be one of my chief ſcruples, that I could not prevaricate with Authority; had there been allowed a little Equivocation, and might I have been permitted to give an aſſent and conſent which were not unfeigned, the task had not been ſo intollerable; but to require ſuch an aſſent and conſent, ſearches men to the bottom, and beats the Hypocrite out of all his Subterfugies; who can bear it?* I anſwer, The declaring of my *unfeigned aſſent and conſent* is a great ſcruple to me, though not hereby to be kept from a little Equivocation with man, but from a down-right lying before God, and againſt mine own Conſcience; and the rather (as you truly obſerve) becauſe ſuch an *unfeigned aſſent and conſent ſearch me to the bottom,* yet not becauſe I am an Hypocrite (according to your ſuppoſition) but becauſe I am none; my tongue and my heart being, as they ought to be, perfect Uniſons, and going together: For if I were an Hypocrite indeed, I could eaſily find my *ſeveral Subterfugies,* and no ſuch Declaration ſhould be ever able *to bear me out* of them. Herein therefore you are out: But in the interim, upon the whole matter you plainly infer, what was denied by your Fore-man, that Conformity is now much ſtricter than in former days; and this alſo deſignedly. p. 2. l. 54.

You ſay, *Becauſe of ſome poſſible* Errata *or faults that may eſcape in the printing of the Book of Common-Prayer, or otherwiſe, I ſcruple to give my unfeigned aſſent and conſent* unto all and every thing contained in it; *but this is a weak foundation, and the Cavil trivial, and therefore you leave me to be noted* in my folly. I anſwer, p. 2. l. penult.

ſwer,

ſwer, It is you, and not I, who make ſuch *Errata*, properly ſo called (which may be found in the Common-Prayer Book, as well as in any other Book, wholly beſides the intention of the Compoſers of them) to be the true, proper, and main ground of my bogling at the Declaration; for I plainly by name except againſt the *Order appointed for reading the holy Scriptures, againſt the Order appointed for the adminiſtration of Baptiſm, and ſo againſt the Order appointed for the burying of the Dead:* Now the things wherein I except againſt theſe, in my apprehenſion, are not *Errata*, but *Errors*, not σφάλματα, but ψεύσματα; however, I am ſure they are not *eſcapes by accident*, and beſides the intention of the Law-makers, but are both *contained in, and preſcribed by the Book, as ſome of the ſubſtance and chief matter of it; and this too confirmed by the Rubrick.* By what I have now ſpoken, I clearly free my ſelf from the abſurdity of calling *Errata the Contents of any Book or Writing, as you would faſten upon me*, againſt all apparent truth and reaſon: And whereas you ſay, *My ſcruple* p. 3. l. 5 *cannot affect you here, becauſe though ſuch* Errata *may be contained in, yet they are not preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer.* I have evidenced the contrary in the inſtances forementioned: wherefore the Coat you would put upon me is more proper for another, who lets the true Enemy alone, and fights againſt his own ſhadow, as if it were an armed man; and then triumphs like a *Thraſo* in his wonderful Manhood for vanquiſhing ſuch an p. 3. l. 1. Appearance. But, ſay you, *Do we not think we may ſafely aſſent and conſent to the Contents of any Writings that paſs an Eſtate for fear of* Errata, *which by frequent copying out, and tranſcribing the enrolled Deeds, may happen to be there?* I anſwer, I never yet heard of any ſuch Writings of Conveyance, or Charters of Liberties and Properties, where the Parties concerned were called to declare their *unfeigned aſſent and conſent* to all and every thing contained in them, or elſe ſhould be puniſhed with the loſs of their Temporal Rights, which yet is the penalty of all thoſe who will not *aſſent and conſent* to all and every thing contained in the Book of Common-Prayer. I have ſometimes ſeen the Accounts of Merchants adjuſted, and *ſubſcribed* by their names, but with this Proviſo, *ſaving all errours in them unknown to our ſelves.* Now upon this condition you and I will quickly compromiſe the difference;

rence; let me inſert theſe words, *Saving all errours which may be found therein,* (as your Fore-man was good at inſerting) and I will readily declare *my unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by the Book of Common-Prayer.*

But I charge my Governours, at leaſt *by inſinuation, with a pretending to an Infallibility, in their requiring an unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all things deviſed and preſcribed by them; but this is an odious Inference.* I anſwer, How odious ſoever, yet if the Charge be true, the odiouſneſs is not at all to be imputed to the Inſinuation, but wholly to the Injunction. p. 3. l. 10.

But, ſay you, *This is deſtructive to the reaſon of all Laws; and by this Argument every Law-giver muſt be ſuppoſed to be Infallible; the end of all whoſe Injunctions are to be aſſented and conſented to.* I anſwer, This is nothing deſtructive to other Laws; becauſe Law-makers in making thoſe Laws, never require of the people any *ſuch unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by their Inſtitutes,* but only ſubmiſſion and obedience. Secular Laws reach only to compliance of the outward man, and not meddle with our thoughts and Conſcience; whereas this Declaration requires the *inward approbation of the mind, will, and heart,* as well as the outward obſervation in matter of practiſe, which is one great ground of our Quarrel againſt it. But, ſay you, *If it be neceſſary there ſhould be a Rule of Uniformity, 'tis neceſſary that men ſubſcribe to it, not as an abſolute Rule of Conſcience, but as a Rule of Peace and Order: and this is all the Church requires, that they ſo far ſubmit their wills and underſtandings to their Governours, as for theſe ends to conform to what they have preſcribed.* I anſwer, We muſt and ought to ſubmit our will and underſtanding to the preſcription of our Governours, both in Conformity, and in every caſe, ſo far forth as Conſcience will allow us, and no further. Conſcience will intermeddle, and be inquiſitive into all our actions, whether we will or no; and if Truth and Right be not at the bottom, *Peace and Order* (which otherwiſe in general ſhould prevail much with us) will never be able to free and juſtifie us from the inward ſevere cenſure and condemnation of it. p. 3. l. 11. p. 3. l. 16.

The Compoſers of this Book of Common-Prayer, thought all things therein right and good in every particular: but unto this

I replied, Though this was their perſwaſion, yet it might not be every mans perſwaſion; and therefore I ſaid, I thought it not equal to compel all others *jurare in verba Magiſtri*, to declare themſelves to be fully of the ſame mind and judgment with them: my reaſon was, *Haſt thou Faith? have it to thy ſelf*; force it not upon others, compel them not to think as thou thinkeſt, and to declare as thou declareſt. Now you would know of the
p. 3. l. 40. *ſcrupulous Non-conformiſt, whether this rule be given to the publick Officers of the Church, or to the private Chriſtian*? I anſwer, This Rule is given to all Chriſtians, whether publick or private; according to the ſeveral occurrences which may befal them. You ſhould have rather queried, *About what this rule is given*? I would have told you, that it was given concerning things which are not evidently and certainly true and good in their own nature, beyond
Rom. 14. 1. all *doubtful diſputation*: now ſuch are many things contained in the Liturgy, as the *reading of* Apocrypha, *ſigning with the ſign of the Croſs*, &c. theſe things are not of an infallible truth, nor are we ſure of the goodneſs of them in their own nature by the Word of God: wherefore here the forementioned rule is moſt appoſite and neceſſary, *Haſt thou Faith? have it to thy ſelf:* in theſe uncertain doubtful matters compel not others to judge as thou judgeſt, nor to affirm what thou affirmeſt. But, ſay you, *why, or*
p. 3. l. 55. *how then can there be any publick* Sanctions *in the world*? I anſwer, There ſhould be no publick Sanctions, eſpecially in the matters of God, and his Worſhip, unto which every private Profeſſor ſhall be called, and neceſſitated to give his *unfeigned aſſent and conſent* (as we are bound to do in all things, with reference to the Liturgy) but the truth and goodneſs of them, in their own nature, ſhould inſtantly and apparently be ſeen by every eye, beyond all ſcruple, or doubtful heſitation; for otherwiſe, whoſoever ſhall ſo declare his *unfeigned aſſent and conſent*, will either do it blindly, at all adventures, or elſe unfaithfully, with a wavering uncertain judgment, or elſe wickedly, againſt his own mind and thoughts. Wherefore the higheſt of publick Magiſtrates may not abuſe their Power into any oppreſſive compulſion, but are bound for Peace ſake, and for Conſcience ſake, not to bind the Conſciences of the people to believe and imbrace their private particular Sentiments, as if they were Oracular, and beyond all queſti-

queſtioning; but leave them to their own liberty to judge as they pleaſe, until ſuch time as they are better informed, and more fully convinced.

But, ſay you, *A publick Church-Officer may reject an Heretick.* p. 3 l. 43. I anſwer, What is this to the matter before us? Becauſe he may reject an Heretick, that is, one who denies the Fundamentals of Religion and Godlineſs, therefore he is above this rule, *Haſt thou Faith? have it to thy ſelf*; and may compel thoſe under him to believe what he believes, and ſay what he ſaith: From ſuch a kind of wild reaſoning, *libera nos!* I profeſs I am at my wits end here, as in ſeveral other places, to find what you drive at; how then ſhall I fence my ſelf againſt you? I wiſhed, as to the Liturgy, our Law-givers had required no more than *uſe and ſubmiſſion, as preceding Governours had done before them.* You ſay, *And what is more required?* p. 4 l. 2. I anſwer, Very much: for when I declare *my unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing, &c.* I ſpeak as much as can be ſpoken in words, to *expreſs my love, approbation, and choice*, concerning all and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by the Book, as moſt true and unqueſtionable to be believed, as moſt eligible and deſirable to be obſerved in every Office, Service, Rite, Ceremony, and Circumſtance thereof; but when I only ſubmit to the uſe of the Liturgy, *I yield*, for peace and order's ſake to my Superiours, *in things not ſimply ſinful and unlawful*, though in themſelves far from *perfection*, and far from *my deſire* in my own free choice and election. And what I have now aſſerted with little leſs than a contradiction to your ſelf, you have acknowledged already in your foregoing diſcourſe, *Paragraph* 4. And in this very *Paragraph* you do it again; when you ſay, 'Tis our Zeal too they are offended at, that beyond what 'our preceding Governours did, with reference to this Book of 'Common-Prayer, we thus ſtrictly enjoyn, that Miniſters do de- 'clare their unfeigned aſſent and conſent; but are not the men we 'have to deal with, thoſe that are gone off from all obedience to 'Church and State, and is it not reaſon we take ſome pledge of 'them for their future integrity? Is any man found guilty of a 'much leſs hainous Indictment, and yet diſcharged without gi- 'ving Sureties for his behaviour? Shall men who have broken 'through Oaths of Allegiance, ſhall ſuch men be diſpleaſed, if p. 4 l. 18.

'we

'we cannot take the Viper into our Breaſt without pulling out 'the Sting? That we dare not admit men of theſe Principles 'and Practices to come into the Church, without giving ſuch 'Caution of their being in good earneſt, as may juſtifie thoſe in 'admitting them, who have the care of the Publick? Now what is the purport and meaning of all theſe words, and many more of the ſame nature, but plainly to tell us, that an harder Yoke is now put upon our Necks, than upon Miniſters in former days? and that our Governours had all reaſon to make our Bonds ſtronger, as for the puniſhment of by-paſt miſcarriages, ſo for the prevention of future relapſes? Here therefore you forget your ſelf.

But, you ſay, 'It is not neceſſary to the aſſent and conſent here
p. 4. l. 59. 'required, that every particular perſon ſhould take upon him ex- 'preſly to determine in all theſe points, 'tis ſufficient that nothing 'is ſinful; much leſs doth it become his humility to oppoſe the 'Opinion he hath of a thing's being good and expedient, to the 'ſenſe and reaſon of his Governours; 'tis matter of obedience 'belongs unto him, &c. I anſwer, Though this be your mind and judgment, I am clearly of another Opinion; I muſt determine, in all points, whether the things be *right and good*, yea or not, before I can *aſſent and conſent* unto them; I muſt be well aſcertained what I affirm for a truth, to be a truth indeed, elſe I may be guilty of ſome degree of lying in ſpeaking the very truth. It is not contrary *to humility*, but the juſt and due *exerciſe of reaſon*, to ſearch into the goodneſs and expediency of whatſoever I am called *to aſſent and conſent unto*, by whomſoever commanded; yea, and to oppoſe my private Opinion to the ſenſe and reaſon of my Governours, if what they ſtile ſenſe and reaſon, ſhall evidently appear to be without ſenſe and reaſon, and at the wideſt diſtance in a contrary way. Every man is bound to ſee with his own eyes, and to judge from his own underſtanding, if he will act like a rational Creature; it is not the part of *Goſpel-humility*, but of *Sheepiſh ſtupidity* to follow our Leaders, not at all conſidering or judging of the way, but by a blind Implicit Faith and ſubmiſſion, yielding to be turned into every path, meerly becauſe it is their pleaſure and appointment. Thus far in general, now in particular.

I excepted againſt the order and appointment for the reading of the holy Scriptures, becauſe many Books of *Apocrypha* are commanded

manded to be read for the Leſſons of the day, as the Book of *Tobit*, *Bell* and the *Dragon*, *&c.* while ſome of the Sacred Canon are wholly left out, *&c.* Now for the removing this Exception, you ſay, 'We deſire that our Governours be not blamed, if ac- p. 5. l. 9.
'cording to their beſt diſcretion they have choſen out ſuch parts
'of Scripture to be read in the Congregation, which are moſt in-
'telligible; and if they have omitted others, which they thought
'would not be for the edification of a vulgar Auditory; and if
'they have mixed ſome of *Apocrypha*, as may be of wholeſome
'inſtruction. I anſwer, Though you would not have your Go-
vernours blamed for this mixture, yet ſome others will queſtion
their zeal and *diſcretion* herein, and think they have juſt reaſon
ſo to do: For who ſhall preſume to be wiſer than Chriſt for the
good nurture of his Church? who ſhall take on them to deter-
mine which is moſt *intelligible*, *and moſt edifying to the people*, ei-
ther the holy Scripture, or any other writings? I am ſure he that
knows it, hath ſaid, *All Scripture* (and therefore that part of
Scripture alſo, which is left out of the Kalendar) *is given by in-
ſpiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for cor-
rection, for inſtruction in righteouſneſs, that the man of God may be
perfect, throughly furniſhed to all good works.* There is no ſuch te-
ſtimony left on Record, concerning any of the *beſt parts of Apo-
crypha*, though ſome of thoſe appointed to be read in the Con-
gregation are far from the beſt; to ſay no more: Therefore this
appointment by our Governours may well be ſcrupled; but then
the other appointment upon this appointment is moſt highly to
be blamed, I mean in their requiring all Miniſters to *declare an
unfeigned aſſent and conſent to this their appointment*, though in
their own hearts (at leaſt many of them) do not approve of this
order, but wiſh it were otherwiſe. *But is this a reaſon*, ſay you, p. 5. l. 16.
to break Communion with a Church, let any man judge? To this I
have anſwered already; for though I would read ſome Books of
Apocrypha, rather than break Communion with the Church, as
poſſibly not being in it ſelf ſinful and unlawful; yet I would ra-
ther break Communion a thouſand times over with the beſt
Church in the world, than be a wilful tranſgreſſor; and ſuch
ſhould I be in a notorious manner, if *a Lye* be a tranſgreſſion;
and I ſhould lye moſt egregiouſly to declare my *unfeigned aſſent*

&c.

and conſent, that is, *my will and deſire to read the Apocrypha*, rather than Scripture in the hearing of the people; for in the bottom of my Soul, and in the truth of my Reins, I am utterly againſt it.

I excepted againſt the order appointed for the Miniſtration of Baptiſm, becauſe of the ſtrict requiring of Godfathers and Godmothers, to ſtand as Sureties and Undertakers for the Child brought to his Chriſtendom, and this upon ſeveral accounts; as,

Firſt, Becauſe it is unſcriptural: Unto this you ſay, 'It cannot
p. 5. l. 37. 'be ſuppoſed that this order of Godfathers and Godmothers 'ſhould be preſcribed in Scripture, the receiving of perſons by 'Baptiſm there being upon their own actual Faith, and before 'there was any National Church wherein this order could be 'obſerved; and it was ſufficient that the Children were then admitted to Baptiſm, as they were in the Covenant; that is, by 'the Faith of the Parents. I anſwer, In theſe words there ſeems to me to be a plain contradiction in themſelves, but nothing of reaſon, why Godfathers and Godmothers are not mentioned in Scripture for the baptizing of Infants. There is a contradiction in them; for you ſay, Perſons in thoſe times were received upon their *own actual Faith*; and yet you preſently add further, that Children were then admitted to Baptiſm *by the Faith of their Parents*. There is nothing of reaſon in them for what they are propounded; for though Parents were received by their own actual Faith, and Children by the Faith of ſuch Parents, what is this of bar and impediment to Godfathers and Godmothers at the baptizing of Infants? or why they ſhould not be mentioned and appointed in Scripture? Surely, in my weak apprehenſion, nothing at all: But the Adult, as you truly ſpeak, in Scripture-times were admitted into the Church by Baptiſm through their own actual Faith, and their Children were inveſted with the ſame Priviledge, by *virtue of the Covenant*, as being there declared in that *Royal Charter and Patent*, *Fellow-Inheritors* of the ſame Promiſe together with their Parents. And are not Children in our days received by Baptiſm in the ſame way, and upon the ſame terms and conditions, as from the beginning? Since therefore (according to your own Conceſſion) their Children then had no Sureties when they were baptized, neither need ours in the like

like Circumſtances. You would confute me, and you confute your ſelf. But you ſay, *Abundans cautela* ſhould not be ſcrupled, but rather commended. I anſwer, Let us not pretend to be more careful than God, in the receiving of thoſe into his Family, whom he commands us to receive; but leave him wholly to his own moſt Sapient Providence, and admit of all ſuch upon his own conditions, and conſult no better. p. 5. l. 41.

Secondly, I objected, that the Father of the Child is left out, not mentioned, nor at all taken notice of at the baptizing. For the vacating of this Objection, you ſay, 'The receiving the 'Child, ſuppoſes the Father concerned in it, becauſe it is through 'his Faith he is in Covenant. I anſwer, You ſpeak ſo much in the Clouds, that I am utterly at a loſs what Arrow you let fly at me, or what you intend. Every Child I know ſuppoſeth a Father, and every baptized Child a believing Parent; yet this believing Parent *is left out*; who notwithſtanding is and ought to be the main Suſceptor and Surety for his Childs good abearing: on him, I ſay, it is incumbent, to promiſe and vow to bring up his Child in the knowledge and obedience of the Chriſtian Faith, much rather than upon Godfathers and Godmothers. But you ſay, 'As to the particular ingaging of the Father for the 'Childs Education, he muſt be worſe than an Infidel, if he do 'not take care for thoſe of his own Houſe. I anſwer, Though I will not, yet ſome would be ready to reply, And therefore the Miniſter is worſe than an Infidel, if he do not mind him of his duty; eſpecially at ſuch a proper and peculiar ſeaſon, when this Parent may well be ſuppoſed to bring his Babe to the Miniſter, deſiring him to receive it, and make it a viſible Church-Member: But in the whole Office of Baptiſm, the Father is not conſidered, nor any thing of his duty ſignified unto him. But you ſay, 'Not to admit Godfathers and Godmothers, might in ſome 'caſes be totally to debar the Child of Baptiſm, becauſe it may 'ſo fall out that the Father may be dead before the Child is born; 'and then how ſhall he be offered to Baptiſm? I anſwer, Though the Father of the Child be dead, yet ſome one or other at all times, either by Nature, as being next of Kin, or by Deputation from the Perſon deceaſed, or ſome other way, will appear *as a Propater, a ſecond Father* to the Child, to offer him to Baptiſm: p. 5. l. 45. p. 5. l. 47. p. 5. l. 51.

but put the caſe that none ſhould appear, yet for want of ſuch a *Sponſor*, the Babe muſt not be debarred of its right, but ought by the care of the Church both to be baptized, and edoctrinated in the Chriſtian Faith.

Thirdly, I objected, that Godfathers and Godmothers are generally brought to the Font to avouch a great untruth, and make themſelves obnoxious of lying and Perjury in the Face of God, and the Church. You ſay, *If they be guilty of this, this is their* p. 5 l. 5. *abuſe of what is well intended.* I anſwer, Whatſoever is found by al ong Quotidian experience to be the occaſion of much ſin, (if it be not in it ſelf abſolutely neceſſary to be done and continued) in prudence and piety alſo it ought to be diſuſed.

p. 5. l. 5. But ſay you, 'The Child alſo may not anſwer the intents and 'purpoſes of that ſolemn Vow in Baptiſm, neither the Father 'make good his promiſe on the behalf of him; and therefore if 'Godfathers and Godmothers ſhall be detained from ingaging, 'for fear and danger of falſifying their promiſes and ingagements, with parity of reaſon the Child alſo upon the ſame account may be detained from being baptized, and the Father likewiſe from being a Surety for him. I anſwer, What God commands is one thing, and what Man commands is another: Whatſoever God commands to be obſerved, muſt be obſerved without regarding Conſequences (and ſuch I hope you apprehend at leaſt the Ordinance of Infant-baptiſm, if not alſo of the Father his then being chief *Sponſor*;) but in all humane commands and appointments conſequences are much to be weighed and conſidered, either as a Motive for them, or a Bar againſt them; and therefore ſuch humane commands ſhould not be impoſed which are never likely to be performed, much leſs thoſe which (as ſuch, and ſuch circumſtances may and often do ariſe and occur) are *tantum non*, next to an impoſſibility; now of this nature are thoſe duties required of Godfathers and Godmothers, with reference to their God-children, and of this kind is the task impoſed upon them, which yet raſhly and inconſiderately enough they undertake to make good and fulfil. You know the charge then given them by the Miniſter, and have given it your ſelf, I ſuppoſe, many and many a time, in theſe words; 'Foraſmuch as this Child hath promiſed 'by you, his Sureties, to renounce the Devil, and all his works,

'to

'to believe in God, and to ſerve him: Ye muſt remember, that is 'your parts and duties to ſee that this Infant be taught, ſo ſoon as 'he ſhall be able to learn, what a ſolemn promiſe and profeſſion 'he hath here made by you: And that he may know theſe things 'the better, ye ſhall call upon him to hear Sermons, and chiefly 'ye ſhall provide that he may learn the Creed, the Lords Prayer, 'and the ten Commandments in the vulgar Tongue, and all other 'things which a Chriſtian ought to know and believe to his 'Souls health, and that this Child may be vertuouſly brought up, 'lead a godly and Chriſtian life. Speak now, Sir, your Conſci-ſcience, and let not prejudice blind you, but tell me, *bona fide*, do you believe when you give this charge to Godfathers and Godmothers, that they are ever likely to perform it? Do you think when you call them to this arduous Province, they can anſwer the ends of it according to the truſt committed to their hands, or according to their ingagements; and not be found lyars? Godfathers and Godmothers, you know, ſometimes live far from their God-children in another Hamlet, Village, Town, City, County, Country; generally they are at a diſtance in another houſe, and in another Street: how therefore is it poſſible for them *to ſee* the ſaid Children to *be taught as ſoon as they are able to learn*? and particularly to be inſtructed concerning the nature and quality of thoſe ſolemn baptiſmal promiſes made on their behalf? How is it poſſible for them to *provide* that the ſaid Children ſhall *learn the Creed, &c. with all other things which a Chriſtian ought to know and believe to his Souls health*? Can theſe things be brought to paſs, and effected, while God-children are down upon their knees, and ask their Godfathers bleſſing? or do they not require continuance of time, with a continual care and diligence? 'Theſe 'words which I command thee this day ſhall be in thine heart, *Deut. 6.* 'and thou ſhalt teach them diligently unto thy Children (*not* '*God-children*) and talk of them, when thou ſitteſt in thine 'houſe, when thou lieſt down, and when thou riſeſt up. Parents who are daily and hourly converſant with their Children *by often talking* in their hearing concerning the matters of Religion both of Law and Goſpel, and by a frequent catechiſing and inſtructing them in the Rudiments thereof, may cauſe the knowledge of Chriſtianity *guttatim* to inſtill into their minds, and ſo train them

up in the right way for their *ſouls health*; but for others to ſee this diligently proſecuted, and faithfully diſcharged, it is ſcarce feaſible, but rather on the contrary utterly impracticable. There-
p.5.l.48. fore although you ſay, this Objection cannot *bear any weight with conſidering men*, it will be found to be otherwiſe.

Before I paſs on to what follows, if it might not diſpleaſe you, I would ask you one queſtion more about Godfathers and Godmothers, Whether when you give them the forementioned charge, your ſelf hold them bound to perform the obligation of it? Did you ever in good earneſt, either in the Pulpit, or out of the Pulpit, mind them of their duty? Did you ever conſer with them in private about the greatneſs and momentouſneſs of their Font-ingagements? One Mr. *Falkner*, I perceive, has written much in the high commendation of the Liturgy; has he any word of Conviction to chide with Godfathers and Godmothers for their Quotidian neglect, and to ſhew them the ſin and danger of it? has he any word of Exhortation to ſtir them up to pay their Vows, and bind their Conſciences to a due care and faithfulneſs herein? What, are we in earneſt, or in jeſt? what, is all meer formality without reality? *At non ludendum eſt in ſacris*; this Scene is not ſeemly, and I wiſh it might not continue.

p.5.l.63. You ſay, *My reaſoning againſt the Croſs is ſo trifling, that you wonder with what face any can urge it*? I anſwer, Be it ſo; but withall, pray let us ſee what ponderous Reaſons you can bring
p.6.l.11. for it? They follow in theſe words, *Did the Ancient Fathers plead ſo much for it in any other ſenſe than Chriſt commanded his Diſciples, to take up their Croſs, and follow him? Are they to imitate their Maſter in doing this, in the whole courſe of their life, and may they not uſe ſo much as a ſign of it to expreſs it to others, or bring them in mind of their duty themſelves? Davus ſum non* Oedipus: I neither underſtand the ſenſe nor the ſcope of theſe words, much leſs how they are urged either againſt me, or for the good and expediency of the ſign of the Croſs in the Miniſtration of Baptiſm. If the Ancient Fathers did plead ſo much for the Croſs in no other ſenſe, *but in Chriſts ſenſe, then in your ſenſe* they pleaded not for it at all; that is, for the ſign of the Croſs to be made in the Forehead by the finger of a Miniſter: For was this the Croſs Chriſt commanded his Diſciples to take up, and follow him?

Are

Are they again, ſay you, *to imitate their Maſter in doing this, and may they* (his Diſciples) *not uſe ſo much as a ſign of it, to expreſs it to others*, (I ſuppoſe you mean by others, *the children baptized*) *or to bring them* (theſe children) *in mind of their duty themſelves?* I anſwer, God never ordained the ſign of the Croſs, to bring us in mind or remembrance of bearing Chriſts Croſs, that is of ſuſtaining τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ χριστοῦ; and drinking what remains behind of that bitter Cup, which the Lord Jeſus did propine to all his Followers: Neither can I ſee any aptitude in the ſign of the Croſs, as it is there applied in Baptiſm, to any ſuch purpoſe. For, firſt, the Croſs is aiery and tranſient upon the fleſh, and not inured in the fleſh; how therefore ſhall that that is vaniſhed bring the Child hereafter in mind of his duty, as *to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt crucified, and manfully to fight under his Banner*? *&c.* Secondly, becauſe the Child baptized is then not a Subject capible of knowing, regarding, or minding what Croſſing imports. Surely therefore if the ſign of the Croſs ſhall be thought at all requiſite and expedient, it would be much better deferred and reſerved for the time of Confirmation; for then Children may well be ſuppoſed to have attained and gained the uſe of Reaſon, to know and remark what is ſaid and done unto them: Yet I confeſs if many of them be not, yet they may and ought to be confirmed (though wholly beſides the true intent and end of that Church-conſtitution) while they are very Children; for this is according to the order in that caſe, which runs in theſe words, *Ye* (Godfathers and Godmothers) *are to take care that this Child be brought to the Biſhop, to be confirmed by him ſo ſoon as he can ſay the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and ten Commandments in the Vulgar Tongue, &c.* My Children, I thank my God, could ſay all theſe as perfectly as my ſelf before they were four years old, and I aſſure you too in the Vulgar Tongue; for I pray tell me, what Proteſtants now teach them their children in Latin? what need therefore of that grave *Item* and Caution? only we muſt ſtill go on in the old road, when the cuſtoms of things are altered and antiquated, and the reaſon of them utterly annihilated: But in the interim, I thought not my Children then fit for Confirmation, but wiſh they may be found worthy ten years after. Col. 1. 24.

And

And now, notwithſtanding what has been ſpoken to the contrary, I will grant you your Plea, viz. *That the ſign of the Croſs is to bring the children baptized in mind of their duty,* to confeſs the Faith of Chriſt crucified, *&c.* But then will it not be too too like a Sacrament upon a Sacrament, thus to add the ſign of the Croſs unto Baptiſm; though for me to ſay ſo, *you ſtile it frivolous?* For what is a Sacrament? *Is it not,* according to the Catechiſm, *an outward and viſible ſign of an inward and ſpiritual grace?* Is not the ſign of the Croſs *an outward and viſible ſign?* and is not the minding of our duty, or the practical remembrance of confeſſing of the Faith of Chriſt crucified, and of manfully fighting under Chriſts Banner, *the inward and ſpiritual grace?* I leave it to your conſideration.

Baptizing it ſelf, I ſaid, *ipſo facto,* does oblige the perſon baptized, and withall exhibits a vertue to every worthy Partaker, to confeſs the Faith, and to fight againſt Sin, the World, and the Devil. Here you except againſt me, and ſay, *The expreſſion looks too like the Sacrament's conferring grace,* ex opere operato. I anſwer, If the expreſſion be fairly and candidly interpreted, it ſignifies nothing leſs in the true ſenſe and meaning of thoſe words, as they are commonly ſpoken, and taken among Divines. You would pick ſomething out of the words *ipſo facto,* which yet there imply no more than this, when the baptizing is over, or the waſhing of water in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is done or performed by the Miniſter, without any future or further ſigning with the ſign of the Croſs. And yet after all, the Sacraments are not *nuda ſigna, ſed ſigna exhibentia & obſignantia* to every worthy Partaker of them; and who are thus worthy, I will acquaint you in ſomething which ſhall be ſpoken to by and by. But to requite you for your kindneſs, I pray Sir, let me know whether my ſaying, *That baptizing in the Name of the Father,* &c. *obliges the perſon, and exhibits the power,* &c. does import and imply the Sacraments conferring grace *ex opere operato,* and not your Rubrick much more, which ſaith, *It is certain by Gods Word, that children which are baptized, dying before they have committed actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved?* Qui alterum accuſat probri, ipſum ſe intueri oportet.

p. 6. l. 23.

For the juſtification of this Rubrick I called for Scripture, and you

you say to that purpose, *What think we of S.* Peter's *telling us,* p.6.l.44
1 Epist. 3. 20, 21. *Where speaking of those who were saved in* Noah's *Ark by water, he subjoyns, the like Figure whereunto even Baptism doth also now save us?* I answer, I think S. *Peter* speaks nothing to the justification of the Rubrick; but only thus far in general, That as *Noah* and his Family in the Ark were saved from the Deluge, so people by Baptism are saved from the worser Deep; and these not only Children before actual sin, but even the Adult also after the perpetration of the same; for such were all they who were housed and saved in the Ark. If therefore you will frame an argument from hence for the salvation of Infants baptized before actual sin, the argument is of like force for men and women baptized, though actually guilty: And then from hence it will follow, that all persons baptized are undoubtedly saved. Here is *opus operatum*, conferring grace with a witness, and without all failure: Though it is far otherwise, as we may see even in that Type of Baptism; for notwithstanding *Cham* was saved in the Ark with an Ark salvation, yet we think him a Castaway; so thousands may be saved with a Baptism-salvation, and yet perish eternally. But you add further, *Christ saith of such* p.6.l.51.
(i. e. *of little children that come unto him, and it is by Baptism only that they can come*) *is the Kingdom of Heaven.* I answer, Granting this coming to Christ is intended of Baptism (as I am wholly of your mind, and glad to find another of mine in this particular) yet this is spoken indefinitely of all little Children, as well as of the baptized, and before their baptizing, and not after; for Christ saith, Because they *are of the Kingdom of God, let them come unto me*; and not, that they may be so; let them come and be signed and sealed, because they are of such a number and order, who shall inherit the Kingdom. Again, though Christ saith, *Of such is the Kingdom of God*; yet *of such*, does not necessarily include all Children in general, though coming unto Christ, but may well be understood of some particulars among them. Your strongest Argument I have reserved to the last, taken out of S. *Mark*, Chap. 1. 4. *Is not Baptism said to be for remission of sins, such it is in it* p.6.l.46.
self, such it cannot but be to those who rightly partake of it; and if Children do this, if by this they are actually brought into the Covenant of Grace, whilst they break no Law, as 'tis only by actual transgression

greſſion they can do this; is it any queſtion that they are undoubtedly ſaved, that is put at leaſt in a ſalvable condition? He has better learned *Ariſtotle*'s *Organon* than ever I can do, who knows to reduce this confuſed heap of both of words and matter into any juſt Syllogiſm. I ſee indeed you are a very cunning Sophiſter, if in nothing elſe, yet in this, that you quote Scripture by halves (I will not tell you like unto whom) leaving out that part of it which would deſtroy your argument, as he thoſe words which would have overthrown his temptation. You ſay, *Is not Baptiſm ſaid to be for remiſſion of ſins?* whereas the Text is thus; *John did baptize in the Wilderneſs, and preach the Baptiſm of Repentance for the remiſſion of ſins.* Mark 1. 4. The Baptiſm therefore here ſpoken of belongs not properly to Infants; for, firſt, it is a Baptiſm of Repentance, of which Infants are not capable: Secondly, it is for remiſſion of ſins, which therefore imply actual ſins, whereas Infants are only guilty of Original ſin, and that is but one. And beſides all this, remiſſion of ſins, there ſpoken of, relates not ſo much unto Baptiſm, as unto Repentance; for *John Baptiſt* his great work was to call people to Repentance, *In thoſe days came the* Baptiſt *preaching, and ſaying, Repent ye, for the Kingdom of God is at hand*; upon this account his baptiſm is ſtiled, *The Baptiſm of Repentance*; and he himſelf ſaith, *Matth.* 3. 11. *I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance*: And as a teſtimony of their true repentance, he called them to his baptiſm, and not otherwiſe; and accordingly if their repentance were unfeigned and ſincere, anſwerable to the outward ſign of it in Baptiſm, their ſins ſhould be remitted unto them, elſe abide upon them, notwithſtanding that waſhing. This is the true intent of the place, as we have it explained from the mouth of *Peter*, *Act.* 2. 38. *Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of ſins.* But notwithſtanding what I have now anſwered, I will yet acknowledge, that true and real Goſpel-baptiſm is for remiſſion of ſins: but then we muſt well underſtand and find out, what this true and real Goſpel-baptiſm is, and wherein it conſiſts; for *John Baptiſt* himſelf ſaith, *I indeed baptize with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, he ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt, and with Fire.* There is *Baptiſma fluminis, & Baptiſma flaminis*, an outward and an inward

ward Baptiſm, the one of Water, and the other of the Spirit; the one to purge away the filth of the body, the other to purge away the filth of the ſoul. Now there is a wide and vaſt difference between theſe two, which are not only diſtinguiſhable, but ſeparable, and often ſeparated the one from the other. The Baptiſm of Water is often without the Baptiſm of the Spirit, and the Baptiſm of the Spirit without the Baptiſm of Water. Where theſe two happily meet together in the ſame perſon, there the bleſſed reſult and conſequence hereof is *ſure pardon, and remiſſion of ſins*, and the final iſſue, undoubted ſalvation; otherwiſe not. But now who ſhall preſume to tell, as to *hic & nunc* (when this and another Child is baptized) concerning the certain concurrence of both theſe? who hath known the mind of God herein? who can diſcover this inſcrutable ſecret? But yet let me not be miſtaken when I ſaid, *otherwiſe not*; for it is to be reſtrained only to the firſt Baptiſm: for though this cannot ſeal unto us the pardon of ſins without the laſt, yet the laſt can do it by it ſelf alone without the firſt. All the Ancient Patriarchs, and Prophets, and holy Confeſſors, and Saints before Chriſt's Incarnation, had only the laſt Baptiſm; and ſince that time, all thoſe Infant-Martyrs under the butchery of *Herod*, had only this laſt Baptiſm; thouſands of the Seed of believing Parents, ſome of them dying before they were born, and ſome of them immediately after, have had only this laſt Baptiſm: that bleſſed Babe which brake out of the Womb, while the Mother of it was now ſacrificing her Body in the Flames, for a teſtimony to the Truth againſt curſed Papiſts, (who moſt cruelly and unnaturally forthwith condemned this young Heretick to be burnt, together with the old one) had only this laſt baptiſm; notwithſtanding the ſins of all theſe (and of all others in the ſame circumſtances) were undoubtedly remitted, and their ſouls undoubtedly ſaved. Though they were not made partakers of the outward waſhing, yet the inward waſhing was graciouſly vouchſafed to them unto life everlaſting: this therefore is that which I would call the true and real Goſpel-baptiſm, κατ' ἐξοχὴν, by way of Eminency; whereas the outward Baptiſm of Water, which is only in the power of man to adminiſter, can never do away ſin, neither can it aſſure us of the remiſſion of the ſame. *He is not a* Jew *who is one outwardly, neither is that*

Circumciſion which is outward in the fleſh; but he is a Jew *who is one inwardly, and Circumciſion is that of the heart, and in the ſpirit*, Rom. 2. 28. In like manner, he is not a Chriſtian who is one outwardly, neither is that baptiſm which is outward on the fleſh, but he is a Chriſtian who is one inwardly, and baptiſm is that of the heart, and in the ſpirit: this, this only is the unerring infallible ſign and ſeal unto us of our intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, and the great bleſſing annexed to it: *I will be merciful unto their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſins and iniquities I will remember no more*, *Heb.* 7. 12. But now who knows, whether all and every one among the multitude of young children that have the baptiſm of the fleſh, have alſo the baptiſm of the heart, and in the ſpirit? This is thick darkneſs, and we cannot pierce through it. Since therefore here we are left *at uncertainty, though the ſaid children be baptized, and though they die before they have committed actual ſin, yet never the more can we be certain by Gods Word, that they are undoubtedly ſaved.*

Yet for all this, the baptiſm on the fleſh, or waſhing with water, is not an inſignificant Ceremony, but has its weighty and momentous ends, according to the wiſe counſel of him that ordained it, handing forth many general bleſſings to all that are baptized; and beſides theſe, more ſpecial favours to every worthy partaker of it; and this ſignal one among others, *Remiſſion of ſins.* And now why tarrieſt thou? ariſe and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the Name of the Lord. But then we muſt carefully ſingle out who are the worthy partakers; there is therefore a double worthineſs, the one external, and the other internal: now theſe ſpecial bleſſings are imparted not to thoſe who are only worthy with an external worthineſs, but with an internal alſo. All they may be ſaid to be externally worthy, who have an outward call, and are duly qualified, according to the rules of the Goſpel, to participate of that Ordinance; and among others, the children of Profeſſors, or the children of believing Parents: All they, and only they have an inward worthineſs, who are the *called of God according to his purpoſe, and choſen in Chriſt before the foundation of the world*: now unto all theſe, and only unto theſe, the Sacrament *does ſign, ſeal, exhibit, and convey the grace of the Goſpel.* When I ſay, *exhibit and convey*, I mean only in *ſuo genere*, according

according to the nature of the Ordinance, as an Inſtrument in the hand of Omnipotency, who worketh in, and by, and with whatſoever means he will, and effecteth all his counſels and ſtupendious works, in this way and manner, with never-failing ſucceſs; as when with the blaſt of Rams horns he tumbled down the Walls of *Jerico*, or to come nearer to the matter in hand, when with the waters of *Jordan* he healed the *Syrian* of his Leproſie. You ſee therefore, that it is not the Sacrament it ſelf, as it is *opus operatum* in the adminiſtration of it, but the Omnipotency and faithfulneſs of God in the application of it, conferring grace; and yet not unto all, but only unto the worthy Partakers, and theſe alſo with an inward worthineſs. To conclude therefore, *as Baptiſm is for remiſſion of ſins*, ſo likewiſe *the Lords Supper, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſins.* It was indeed *for remiſſion of ſins unto the Eleven, but not unto* Judas, though he drank of that Cup as well as his Colleagues, yea and had a worthineſs for it, that is an outward worthineſs, and was rightly admitted unto it, but wanted the inward: To the inwardly worthy the bleſſing is communicated, but from all others the bleſſing is ſuſpended.

Among other things you ſay, *Children by Baptiſm are actually brought into the Covenant of Grace.* Here again I might faſten upon you the *opus operatum* conferring grace, as well as you upon me from a leſſer cauſe: but I paſs it by to tell you of another errour; for children of believers *were actually*, i. e. *really and truly in the Covenant of Grace before their Baptiſm*, becauſe it is by vertue of their intereſt in that Covenant, that they are admitted to that Ordinance: Baptiſm is but an open Declaration of that which before was more latent and implicit; it ſtrengthens our Claim to the Covenant, but our Title was good and ſure before. In a word, Baptiſm is as the mutual ſealing, when both ſides are agreed; the Articles are drawn up, all things are concluded, and now only to be conſummated, by ſetting their Hands and Seals. p. 61. 43.

Children, ſay you, *baptized, and dying before actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved, that is, put at leaſt in a ſalvable condition.* I anſwer, After all your ſtrong Proofs and Arguments, you faint in your great Aſſertion, and very tamely are contented to come down p. 61. 52.

to lower Terms. *Undoubtedly ſaved, that is, to be in a Salvable condition.* You are like the wiſe Steward, who inſtead of an Hundred Talents willed the Debtor to write down Fifty. *Undoubtedly ſaved*, and to be *put into a Salvable condition*, are no Synonyma's; for the laſt is far ſhort from an Equipolency to the firſt. There is a vaſt difference between a *Non poſſe non vivere*, and a *poſſe non mori*, between a neceſſary enjoyment of life with the utmoſt ſecurity from death, and the moſt poſſible yea probable attainment of life, *cum formidine contrarij*, with the hazzard of the contrary. Of theſe two, *Undoubtedly ſaved* is the firſt, and *a Salvable condition* is the laſt. You know the *Proverb*, A bird in the hand. *Undoubtedly ſaved* is a Ship arrived, put in and ſafely come to ſhore, paſt all danger; a *Salvable condition* is a ſhip far off on the main: Though ſhe be a ſtout and ſtrong built Veſſel, with all her Tacklings firme and compleat, and in a good and likely way to make a proſperous Voyage yet ſhe may miſcarry and periſh in the deep. Your paraphraſe therefore is paradox to the Text, though ſound and Orthodox in it ſelf; Children Baptized are indeed in a Salvable condition, not only before, but alſo after they have committed actual ſin: yea (according to the Doctrine of the Liturgy, in the order appointed for the burial of the dead) not only Children, but grown up men, committing actual ſins (ſins of the deepeſt die, moſt groſs immoralities, not to be named among Chriſtians, Heaven-daring and Hell-deſerving ſins, all the days of their lives, unto their laſt *Exit*) are ſtill in a Salvable condition: Or elſe how can they be thought to be in an hope-able condition? You know what is read over all ſuch, when they are brought to the Grave. *That when we ſhall depart this life we may reſt in him (in* Chriſt) *as our hope is this our Brother doth.* There is a *Goſpel without an hope* to relie upon the promiſe of it, and there is *an hope*, I ſee, *without a Goſpel* to juſtifie the reaſon of it. But that remains yet to be diſcuſſed: I therefore return to the matter before us. *Children Baptized* are in a *Salvable condition*, that is in a right, hopeful, and probable way of ſalvation, according to the Goſpel. For though Chriſt hath ſaid it, *many are called, and few are Choſen*; and though from hence, even becauſe of the multitude who are called into Gods Family continually by Baptiſme, as from other Objections,

ſome

ſome Scruples may ariſe in our minds, powerful enough *to take off*, and hinder the full Aſſurance, and *certain belief of the undoubted Salvation* of all ſuch; yet becauſe the ſecret things of Election belong wholly to God, and the revealed things of the outward call only unto us, we according to what is revealed unto us in that outward call, may and ought to judge Charitably concerning all Infants Baptized, and hope well of their Eternal State. In the general, we have good reaſon to believe, that God will own and bleſs his own Ordinances, and grant Salvation to his people in his own ways and Inſtitutions appointed for ſuch an end. Truth hath ſaid it, *He that believeth and his Baptized ſhall be ſaved.* Children, I confeſs cannot actually believe, and ſo perhaps this promiſe is not properly theirs: yet they cannot wholly be debarred of it; for even in their infancy, the ſeed of Grace, and the ſeed of Faith, may be ſown and Rooted in their Hearts; but however they are *actually Baptized*, which leads on directly to the *Bleſſing* there mentioned, and has ſuch a full and fair Aſpect upon the ſame, that I would not be wanting of the Ordinance of Baptiſme my ſelf, nor deprive my Children of it for Thouſands of Gold and Silver; and the rather becauſe Wiſdom hath ſaid again, *Except a man be born of Water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.*

You have therefore my vote and ſuffrage, for the *Salvable condition Children Baptized*: I leave them in the way of life, while yet they are living: in *via Salutis, dum viatores*, but how they can be thought or ſaid to be ſo *in termino*, after they are gone to their long, laſting, Everlaſting home; or how you can apply this for the vindication of the Rubrick, is beyond my underſtanding. *It is certain by Gods Word, that Children which are Baptized, dying before they commit actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved; that is*, ſay you, in your explanation, *they are put at leaſt in a Salvable condition*, what are they ſtill but *in a Salvable condition after dying*? I ſhall make no remark upon this remarkable---but am ready to Treſpaſs another way, even *volens nolens. Quis tale legendo Temperet a riſu*? Nevertheleſs this ſhall be ſpoken for your Honour, that you are a more generous Opponent than the former; for you intrepedly

pedly and Heroickly own juſtifie the Truth of the Rubrick; when as he moſt baſely and ſneakingly would have ſhuffled it off by the ſlight of evaſion: not allowing it any place in his *aſſent and conſent*, though it hath evidently a *place in the Liturgy* and is a part of the whole.

But then on the other ſide, I think him more ſober than your ſelf, though he call a certain query of mine, *A raving queſtion:* which was this, ſince Baptizing gives ſuch an unqueſtionable Title unto heaven, may a Miniſter deny the Ordinance to any infant whatſoever, if he might be permitted to Adminiſter it? In particular I brought down the queſtion to a True believer, whoſe Child had an unqueſtionable right unto Goſpel Baptiſme according to the Terms and conditions of the Goſpel; Whether, if ſuch a believer ſhould bring his Child to the Font, and deſire the Miniſter to have it Baptized, but yet either out of weakneſs or tenderneſs of Conſcience, Scruples God-Fathers and God-Mothers, and the ſign of the Croſs, and dares not admit of them, the Miniſter may and ought upon that ſcore deny his
p. 19. 26. Babe Chriſtendom? He ſaith in ſuch a Caſe *the anſwer is plain, that he ought not.* Though here he ſpeaks without Book, I mean the Common-prayer Book, and againſt the Order of it in the Baptizing of Infants. Whereas you ſay on the contrary in theſe words, *That odium he* (meaning me) *would load the Miniſter with, that ſhall deny to Adminiſter Baptiſm to them, who come not according to the Rule of the Church---are* (ſurely it ſhould be, *is*, re-
p. 7. l. 9. ferring to odium) *beſides our Argument, 'tis ſufficient he* (the Miniſter) *hath no Title* (I think you mean *hath no right*, for I am often at a loſs to unriddle you) *ſo to do it, that he is more ſerious in his function, than to be knowingly unjuſt, either to the truſt the Church or God himſelf, as I may ſay, hath repoſed in him.* If a Father come to have his Child Baptized, but not according to the Rules of the Church: The Miniſter has no Title ſo to do it, and therefore in ſuch Circumſtances will be more juſt to the truſt repoſed in him than to Baptize the ſaid Child. If this be not the purport and intention of your words, you ſpeak unintelligibly: but if they be, you fight againſt your fellow Souldier, yea and againſt Truth it ſelf. Shall we obey God or Man? Chriſt hath ſaid, *Go and diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them in the name*

of

of the Father, &c. and among others, the Children of believing profeſſing Parents, *ſimply becauſe they are ſo:* This is the True Goſpel truſt put into the hands of Goſpel Miniſters; well, but the Church or man commands, to Baptize them *with God-Fathers and God Mothers, and the ſign of the Croſs, meer accidents and acceſſories*, forreign from the Nature and Eſſence of Baptiſm, but only invented and impoſed from Humane Tradition; which therefore ſome weak and Scrupelous believers, queſtion and fear as a profanation of that Holy Ordinance, and accordingly dare not ſo addreſs themſelves with their Children unto Baptiſm. But now ſhall their Babes upon this account be denyed their birth-right? Shall they be denyed a priviledge ſo excellent and ſo deſirable? Shall a pitiful order of the Church in Compariſon over-rule and obtain? Shall it be heeded and obſerved by the Miniſter more than the *Regia placita* of heaven it ſelf? God forbid.

I Objected againſt the order for the burial of the dead; becauſe what is there ſpoken to God and man, though often at the interment of the worſt of ſinners, is ſpoken of them as if they had been Saints. and moſt devout Holy perſons, and their Souls then in a ſafe and happy State. For firſt the Congregation by the mouth of the Miniſter ſpeaks as it were to themſelves one to another, concerning the party deceaſed, *Foraſmuch as it hath pleaſed God of his great mercy to take unto himſelf the Soul of our dear brother.* He is a Brother, a dear Brother, his Soul is now taken by God, taken in mercy, in great mercy, and it is taken to himſelf. And then when Corps is put into the Grave, he continues his ſpeech in theſe words, *we therefore commit his body to the ground, in a ſure and certain hope of the Reſurrection to Eternal life.* Then Secondly the *Congregation, in* the cloſe of the Office, by the mouth of the *Miniſter, ſpeaks* unanimouſly to God, *we meekly beſeech the O Father, to raiſe us from the death of ſin to the life of righteouſneſs; that when we ſhall depart this life we may reſt in him*, Chriſt Jeſus, *as our hope is this our Brother doth.* What can be ſaid more, if the moſt Holy Martyr, or confeſſour, if *Stephen* again were carried to his Burial? Let him be a *Nabal*, a *Cain*, a *Judas*, yet here is (if I might uſe the Word) his Apotheoſis, his enthronization among

p. 71. 15. among the Crowned in Celeſtial glory. You ſay, *I have only this to ſay, That it is in the judgment of Charity we pronounce this of all.* I anſwer, Charity with judgment, is a gracious Excellency, but without judgment, it is the greateſt abſurdity, and nothing elſe but the vain opinion of an over-pittiful ſimplicity. But if Charity be with judgment, then it muſt have ſome Rule of judging: and if the right Golden Rule, then this Rule is the Word, for I know no other; Now if Charity hath this Golden Rule of the Word to judge by, then Charity can have no hope for ſome (many) flagitious abominable ſinners, ſo living and ſo dying, when they are brought to be buried; as ſuppoſe two Hectors falling out, and fighting for a Miſs, and both killing one another in the place; or let it be one of them: which happens too too often: ſuppoſe ſome High-way Gentlemen in the very Act of Robbery, ſhot down ſtark dead the ſame moment by the Honeſt Traveller, and thus I might inſtance in many like Caſes. Here, if we will ſpeak ſoberly and according to Truth, we can have no hope: nothing being written in the whole Bible, from end to end, to ground the leaſt of any ſuch hope upon. Here to mention, *what happened to the Thief upon the Croſs, and what may be the dealings of God with the moſt profane wretch at the laſt Minute*, as you do; and what may befall the moſt profligate perſons, *inter pontem & fontem*, as ſome others; is a vain excuſe, and cannot afford the leaſt ſhew or ſhadow of a juſt Apology. As for the Thief upon the Croſs, a wonderful Act of mercy was extended to him at the laſt, by an extraordinary priviledge, at an extraordinary occaſion; but withal we know what a wonderful extraordinary Teſtimony he gave of his Faith, and of the Change of his heart before expiration. The order for the burial of the dead, might have been proper enough at his interment: but would it alſo have been as proper at the interment of the other his Copartner in ſin? Had he ſuffered in *England* (ſuppoſing all things then as now) he might have then been buried according to Liturgy. For I ſee none elſe excluded, but the *unbaptized, Excommunicate, and laying violent hands upon themſelves*; and yet even theſe alſo upon your grounds may equally be admitted to Chriſtian burial; I am ſure the firſt of them

them, *the unbaptized*, may upon far better; and as for the worſt of the other, who knows how gracious God may be *in his dealings with them in the laſt Minute*? Who knows? None can know: and becauſe none can know, therefore none can hope: for hope without knowledge is a meer Nullity. As for what we know concerning ſuch abominable wicked workers (if we believe the Holy Scripture, which ſaith, *Neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers, nor Thieves, nor Covetous, nor Drunkards, nor revilers, nor Extortioners ſhall ever inherit the Kingdome of God*; which ſaith, *without regeneration and holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord*, and every where to the like purpoſe) it ſpeaks their condition deſperate and damned; and therefore with ſilence, but without hope, we muſt leave them wholly to the diſpoſition and determination of God their judge. And this alſo you ſeem to to acknowledge and concede: for in making good thoſe words, *ſince it hath pleaſed God of his great mercy to take unto himſelf*—you ſay, *That it is not neceſſary the Words* in great mercy *ſhould refer to the Perſons taken away, for it may be mercy,* p. 7. l. 17. *and a great mercy, to them who ſuffered by their injury, or ill Examples, ſuppoſing them to be ſuch in whom no ſhew of goodneſs did appear.* I anſwer, I thank you heartily for this new Notion, which never before came upon the imagination of my thoughts, nor perhaps of any other: ſo that you may ſay in a boaſt as *Zabbarel* (if I hit right upon his name) *Ego primus hoc inveni.* Verily the *Gens Togata*, I mean all of the Clergy, are much your Debtors, and I hope in gratitude will highly extoll the *acumen* of your wit, and the pregnancy of your invention. For a recompence, I think my ſelf bound to tell you a ſtory, which this rare piece of Fancy of yours brought freſh into my remembrance. In thoſe days (when the Book of ſports and paſtimes, as Lawful and expedient to be indulged to youth, and fit to be exerciſed on the Lords day) was commanded to be publiſhed, and accordingly was read in moſt Congregations; *Deus bone!* What are the beſt of men, the Tribe of *Levi*, the Sons of the Church themſelves, when they come to be Tryed! Yet there were ſome of them Non-conformiſts to the reſt, who neither could nor would do what was then required, what ever they ſuffered. One of them a moſt worthy Preacher, was deſired by ſome of his Chief Pariſhoners to

viſit his friends in another County, and to abſent himſelf from them three weeks or a month together: and in the interim they procured an Old certain Saint *John* (a very obſcure perſon, who neglected his dreſs, but cheriſhed the Hair of his face and beard at a ſtrange rate) to do this good turn for him: who by the like Crotchet of an extraordinary fancy was ready at their ſervice, and made no bones of it. He comes therefore, and appears in the Desk, after the manner of ſome Wild Satyr out of a Wood, and for the better grace of the matter, what he ſpake was with a Twanging Tone out of his Noſe. Well; he ſets upon the performance of the work, and reads over the Book of Sports diſtinctly and audibly: but when he had done, he added as followeth; Beloved Brethren! Here the King gives you liberty to play on Sundays, and to exerciſe youth in vain ſports and paſtimes, which to do is a profanation of the Sabbath, and a breach of Gods Holy commandment: but now, brethren! do you underſtand the Kings mind, and his true intent and meaning herein? Why, I will tell you, my brethren! a Father has a ſtubborn rebellious Child, and he ſees his Temper, and ſpirit from time to time, aukward and croſs to do any thing he is bidden, but rather more reſolved and forward to do the contrary; wherefore the Father, when he would have any thing done by this perverſe and froward boy, forbids him the doing of it: but what indeed he would not have done, he charges him to do it. Thus in like manner, my brethren! Our good and gracious King has commanded us to obſerve the Sabbath in coming to Church, and in a Religious ſerving and Worſhipping of God, by many good preceeding Laws, and Orders for that end and purpoſe: but ſtill ſuch is our contumacy and wickedneſs, that we drink and play, and have our Dances and Revels on that bleſſed day, in a ſhameful manner: wherefore he ſeeing our perverſe Rebellious carriage, againſt his former good Precepts, he ſpeaks unto us by contraries, He *bids now play on Sundays*, but his true meaning is, that we *ſhould no longer play*, as formerly we have done, but keep God's Sabbath better, and more Religiouſly; this is all our good and gracious King (judging of us according to our wonted croſſeneſs) intended in publiſhing this book of liberty, and I hope will follow upon

upon the reading of it. Here was a ſtrange unexpected, and unlooked for enucleation of the mind of the King, as now yours is of the words of the Liturgy. When I heard this relation firſt, I was hugely pleaſed with it: and ſaid, it was pity ſome Courtier had not not acquainted the King with it; who certainly would have rewarded this rare interpreter with a Dean's or Prebend's place, for his eminent underſtanding and ſervice herein: I wiſh you the ſame ſucceſs in your parallel Atchievement. But in the interim we muſt conſider, whether thoſe words *in great mercy* can admit of any ſuch avulſion from the words following, which relate unto the dead, to be an Apoſtrophe to them that are living? Let us read them and weigh them, *For as much as it hath pleaſed God of his great mercy, to take to himſelf the Soul of our dear brother here departed*, &c. Therefore the perſon here ſpoken of cannot be (as you would ſuppoſe him) a man of an *ill example, an injurious perſon, and in whom no ſhew of goodneſs did ever appear*, for he is a brother, a dear brother, and his Soul now taken to God and accordingly theſe words, in *great mercy*, muſt refer unto himſelf the perſon taken away, and not unto others; unto whom this his being taken away, was rather *in judgment*, and for Correction, by the loſs of ſuch a dear brother. Notwithſtanding procure *a Rubrick* to confirm your interpretation, for until then (according *to your own lock*) I may not believe it: but when I ſhall ſee that once affixed, let the turning of theſe words, *in great mercy*, from the dead to the living, be proper or improper, it ſhall be all one in the Caſe; for your ſenſe of them ſhall be moſt authentick with me. p. 7. l. 17. p. 3. l. 7.

You have yet another Salve for the ſore place, to juſtifie this laſt Office for the dead, in theſe words, *Nor have I ever thought the perſon Officiating, obliged to uſe this form of burials intirely in all Caſes---ſomething I conceive may be left to the diſcretion of the Prieſt, eſpecially with the advice of his Ordinary*, &c. Your meaning plainly is this, that you may leave out ſome part of what is appointed to be read for the burial of the dead, if the perſons buried be not ſubjects proper for it, but utterly the contrary. As for Example, if the perſon to be buried, has been a notorious fugitious offender from firſt to laſt, then *after your own diſcretion*, eſpecially with the *advice of your Ordinary*, you may p. 7. l. 23. l. 27.

leave out the words, *in great mercy*, and *to himſelf dear*, and the like, and read only thus, *Foraſmuch as it hath pleaſed God to take the Soul of our brother, we therefore commit his body*, &c. Thus likewiſe in the cloſe, you may omit thoſe words, *as our hope is this our brother doth*, and read it thus, *That when we ſhall depart this life, we may reſt in him, and at the general Reſurrection be found acceptable in his ſight*, &c.

I Anſwer, It would be well, if the Miniſter might thus be left to his *own diſcretion*, ſuppoſing all parties agreed, and that there would be no ſcandal in the Caſe; which I look upon as an impoſſibility. For put the Caſe, after you have declared *your unfeigned Aſſent and Conſent to all and every thing contained in the book of Common-prayers*, before the face of God, and the Congregation, one of them ſhould immediately ſtep forth and ſay, Sir do you like and approve of all, and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by the order for the burial of the dead? E're long your Office will call you to bury as curſed, Reprobate wretches as ever breathed; for too too many ſuch are among us. Do you think it lawful and expedient to ſtile every one of that ſort, *dear brother*? can you then with a good Conſcience ſay, *God in great mercy hath taken his Soul to himſelf*? Or can you expreſs *your hope* before God, even *ſure and certain hope, of his reſting in Chriſt*, and etetnal happineſs? What now will you anſwer to his Queſtions? will you bring in your laſt mentioned plea, and think to help and juſtifie your ſelf by it? Will you replie thus, Friend, I have indeed in your hearing, as in the hearing of the whole Congregation, *declared my unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all, and every thing contained in, and preſcribed by the book of Common-prayer*, and by conſequence, as you juſtly infer, *to all and every thing appointed for the burial of the dead*; but yet you muſt know, I have a mental reſervation according to *my own diſcretion*; and beſides, *my Ordinary*, though I have avouched I will do this and that, *has given me a ſecret Licence, to leave it undone in ſuch and ſuch Caſes*; and in this very Caſe in particular about burying the dead; and therefore when I ſhall judge it meet and neceſſary, I will omit ſeveral Expreſſions, when they ſhall not be proper nor applicable to the perſons to be buried, or at leaſt I will

take

take the words in a contrary ſenſe, according to what they are uſually taken? ſhould this be your anſwer? but with what forehead could you utter it? How quickly might the ſaid perſon reply upon you, to your ſhame and confuſion, in this or the like manner? Belike, Sir, though you have declared *your unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all, and every thing contained in and preſcribed by the book of Common-prayer*, you have but jugled in all you have declared; you have your private reſervations and exceptions, and your Ordinary has given you a Licence to profeſs one thing, and do another; I ſee your heart and mouth have not gone together, but you ſpeak and think two ſeveral ways. I took you for a good Proteſtant Miniſter, but I perceive you are a meer Jeſuite: an *Ireland*, a *Gavan* can do no more. What way you could deviſe, to free your ſelf from this impeachment, is altogether beyond my thoughts.

Sir, You well obſerved a certain ſort of Miniſters among your ſelves, *pitied in their Non conformity, as doing good men, what they would not do, if they were not forced to it*, and therefore they huddle up *and curtail the prayers*, and ſhew induſtriouſly by the manner of performance how little they like and approve of what they do. This what you ſay, I have heard my ſelf ſpoken in their praiſe, and themſelves much commended for it; but I have always thought them ſo far from being worthy of praiſe, that I have eſteem'd them moſt worthy of cenſure and condemnation; and my heart has riſen againſt them beyond all others. This is wretched ſimulation, and a baſe pitiful diſguiſe. Surely after *I had declared my unfeigned aſſent and conſent to all and every thing contained in the Liturgy, before* the whole Congregation, I would be faithful to mine own word, and juſtifie my profeſſion by a conſonant practice: I would not *curtail the prayers*, but have the Courage before all the world to read them diſtinctly and reverently, and do all in a moſt ample manner, as the matter did require, ſcorning *aucupare famam*, to get the good opinion of any, by ſhewing my ſelf an Hypocrite. And thus, Sir, it ſhould be with you in your own concern; after *your declaration*, it behoves you to be True unto it in every Iota and Tittle, frankly, roundly, and entirely coming up to the full performance of it, and of all and every thing required by it, yea even p. 41. l. 38.

in

in the *order for the burial of the dead*, any word, phraſe, expreſſion, or paſſage therein in any wiſe notwithſtanding.

Moreover, beſides this Scandal (ariſing from your laſt contrivance of clearing your ſelf) a worſe yet might follow in the event and iſſue: even ſometimes to the peril and danger of your life, ſhould you indeed do, as you ſay *you have liberty*; that is, ſhould you leave out thoſe words, phraſes, and expreſſions, wherein the piety and felicity of the party deceaſed is ſignified and declared, it would never be endured: Suppoſe the perſon interred, ſome Lord, Knight, or Gentleman; a Perſon, of worth I cannot ſay, but of wealth and quality, though in the time of his life, he was never ſo wicked and ungodly, yet now that he is dead, he muſt be reputed a worthy good man in all kinds, and nothing thought or ſaid amiſs of him: a pompous Funeral is prepared for him, and his friends with much ſolemnity, follow the Bier, expecting for him the due and accuſtomed Honour of Chriſtian burial, and that every word be there ſpoken over him by the Miniſter in the very form and manner as it is preſcribed; if therefore you ſhall preſume to take your liberty, and uſe your diſcretion to skip over any thing in the Sepulture of him, which of others you do not; it will be taken as an affront, and an unpardonable Treſpaſs by his then preſent Relations; and ſo perhaps ſome Son, brother, or fellow Hector, ſhall be ready to tumble you into the Grave after him, or offer ſome other abuſe, to your great miſchief and evil. Yea the meaneſt will not endure ſuch a Reproachful Reflection upon their Relations, but will hate you for it in their hearts. You ſee therefore this ſtratagem of *leaving out at diſcretion* will Challenge your diſcretion, but never do your work. And conſequently as things are now ordered in the Liturgy, and as you *have unfeignedly aſſented and conſented to them in the declaration*, you muſt be again and again a Tranſgreſſour either to God or man, in the burials of the dead. But,

p. 122. You ſay, *The Church muſt frame her Offices to ſuit thoſe, who are her real Members.* I anſwer, Here is the wiſdom of the Church to frame all her Offices and Services in ſuch a manner as may be furtheſt from all Scandal in one kind or other; and count that moſt ſutable, that is moſt conducible to ſuch an end.

end. To ſpeak therefore about the Office for the burial of the dead, It is known upon matter of fact, that *all men have not Faith*, 'Tis known that moſt, who are named Profeſſors, and live in Church-Communion, are yet Graceleſs, Chriſtleſs perſons; and in this wretched woful condition go commonly out of the World. Shall it now notwithſtanding be thought ſuitable and ſeemly, in the burying of all theſe, to ſpeak of them, as if they were Saints, and true ſincere approved Diſciples of Chriſt? Surely, Sir, if you would freely declare your mind from the unprejudiced ſentiments of an unforeſtalled judgment, you muſt needs bring in your Negative, and ſay, *It is far from being ſuitable, but rather inſufferable.* What therefore of help and remedy ſhall be found in the Caſe? Surely methinks ſome forme of words in general, *concerning death, and judgment, and the other world*, with good and wholſome prayers correſponding, and to the ſame purpoſe, might be ſo contrived (for the edification of the hearers, without intermedling at all with the particular condition of the party deceaſed, either to his praiſe or diſpraiſe) that no juſt offence might be either given or taken by any. This is the ſudden and *extempore effuſion* of my Pen in this matter. Until ſome ſuch Courſe be taken, I am well pleaſed that I have no call to bury the dead, nor can I, *rebus ſic ſtantibus*, ever declare my *unfeigned aſſent and conſent unto them.* p. l. 22.

A POSTSCRIPT.

I Have yet two Queries to propound to mine Opponents, to each of them their queſtion, and ſo I ſhall take my leave of them for the preſent.

You therefore, Sir, who appeared firſt againſt me, highly app'aud the writings of the Apochrypha, and plead much for the verity of them in themſelves, and the uſefulneſs of them as to the reading of them to the people; for you ſay, *Few Pro-*
p.10.l.16 *teſtant Writers of any note*, (I would you had named ſome of thoſe noted men) *but have commended, at leaſt have allowed of the reading of them*; that is, in the publique Aſſembly, and Congregation, as well as other Scripture; and you except againſt me for ſtiling them, *Fabulous Legends*, and ſay, *many of the ancient Fathers did believe them to be true ſtories*, (as true as Goſpel) *and though he* (A. B.) *is pleaſed to call them* Fabulous Legends, *I never yet ſaw any Arguments to prove them Fables, but what would admit of a fair ſolution, and when this Author produces any, I ſhall conſider them.* And you add, *but ſuppoſing them Fables, they are nevertheleſs fit for all that to be read in the Chriſtian Aſſemblies: ſince they may ſerve for inſtruction, or comfort, or reproof, as the Parables of our Saviour do.* What, Sir, do you think what you ſpeak? What *as the Parables of our Saviour do*? What, ſhall the Fables of Apochrypha be avouched, *to ſerve for inſtruction, comfort and reproof as the Parables of our Saviour do*? Is this *as* a Conjunction of equality, or onely of aliquality? To my beſt Remembrance it is *Aquinas* his diſtinction, and it is needful here to free you from an horrid blaſphemy: you might well therefore have affixed ſome word of rebate to your word *as*, to have avoided all imputation of it. Yet this is not the queſtion I have to propound: but ſince you declare your mind and judgment, for the truth and goodneſs of the Apochryphal writings, I would enquire of you,

Q. What ſtrong convincing, and Cogent Motives of credence wrought you into this perſwaſion, and brought you into this mind?

The

The reading of this Paragraph ſet me a wondring; but certainly you have ἀπόκρυφόν τι ſomthing hidden in your breſt beyond vulgar knowledge to juſtifie *Apocrypha*; which I would gladly underſtand for my better information. For I confeſs unto this day, I have entertained a quite different, yea utterly a contrary apprehenſion of them. Among many others theſe are two of my reaſons: firſt, becauſe they contain in them ſeveral Doctrines, not only inconſiſtent with themſelves, but alſo repugnant to the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament. Secondly, becauſe they report and witneſs many things as really tranſacted and done, which ſound reaſon and common ſenſe (if they may be heard to ſpeak) will unanſwerably tell you, can be nothing elſe but Monſtrous and incredible fiction, impoſſible in nature, and at as great an Elongation from Faith and Verity, as whatſoever was Hatched in the brains, or mentioned by the pens of *Heſiod*, *Homer*, or any other of the greateſt and moſt famous of thoſe lying Poets. I remember very well, when I was but a little young School-boy in reading over the books of the *Maccabees*, many of thoſe ſtrange ſtories found as little belief in me, but that of one *Razis*, a Jew I judged to be a notorious untruth, and continue to be of the ſame mind unto this day. For thus it is written of him, 2 *Maccab. Chap.* 14. *v.* 37. *Now there was accuſed unto* Nicanor *one* Razis *one of the Elders of* Jeruſalem, *a lover of his Country men and a man of very good report, who for his kindneſs was called, a Father of the* Jews---*ſo* Nicanor *willing to declare the hate he bare unto the* Jews *ſent above five hundred men of war to take him*-----*now when the multitude would have taken the Tower, and violently broken into the utter door, and bid the fire ſhould be brought to burn it, he being ready to be taken on every ſide, fell upon his Sword Chuſing rather to die manfully* (that is to be guilty of ſelf Murder) *then to come into the hands of the wicked, to be abuſed otherwiſe then beſeemed his Noble Birth: but miſſing his ſtroak through haſt, the multitude alſo ruſhing within the doors, he ran boldly up to the wall, and caſt himſelf down manfully amongſt the thickeſt of them; but they quickly giving place, and a ſpace being made, he fell down into the midſt of the void place. Nevertheleſs while there was yet breath within him, being inflamed with anger he roſe up, and though his blood gaſhed*

out like ſpouts of water, and his wounds were grievous; yet he ran through the midſt of the throng, and ſtanding upon a ſteep Rock, when as his Blood was now quite gone, he pluckt out his bowels, and taking them in both his hands, he caſt them upon the throng, and calling upon the Lord of Life and Spirit to reſtore him thoſe again, thus he died. Here is ſuch a Concatenation of prodigies, in this one Narration, that nothing leſs than a prodigy of credulity can aſſent to any one particular of them. It is marvellous that the fall of *Razis*, from the Top of the High wall of the Caſtle (eſpecially he caſting himſelf down violently from thence, and falling upon the bare ground or pavement, for they quickly gave place, and did not bear him up) had not immediately done his buſineſs for him upon the ſpot; had not immediately beaten his brains out of his head, his bowels out of his belly, and breath out of his body; at leaſt put him out of all Capacity of riſing and running; and this through a throng of people, and theſe a throng of Souldiers and Armed men, and they alſo Aſſayling him on every ſide; for they were ſent to Seize his perſon, and to bring him Priſoner. Alas our *George*, and *Arthur* are not ſo much, if compared with this great Heroe *Razis*, as a Graſhopper with *Goliah*! The moſt renowned of ſuch Knights have loſt their Spurs; *Ecce homines Homunciones blancati quaſi lilia*, as he ſaid merrily in another Caſe: which will more notoriouſly appear in the concluſion of this moſt aſtoniſhing Tragical Exploit: for behold though *his blood guſhed out like Spouts of water*, yea when *his blood was now quite gone*, and not one drop of it left in the veins, (which might befall him, either by the violence of the aforeſaid fall, or from the many wounds he had received from the Swords of the Souldiers, or otherwiſe; for we are left at uncertainties.) *Yet even then he called upon the Lord of life!* It is written indeed of our Saviour, that after he had loſt much blood upon the croſs, he cryed out with a loud voice, ſaying, *Eli, Eli, lama-ſabachthani, and yeilded up the Ghoſt.* But this was wholly and altogether above the power of nature, and therefore worthily counted one of his laſt Miracles; becauſe great Effuſion of blood does neceſſarily enervate the parts of the body inſtrumental and requiſite to ſpeech, beyond the poſſibility of framing or uttering any articulate

Mr. P. S.

articulate voice, or indeed any ſound at all. Which therefore (as ſome have thought) the Centurion hearing and obſerving, being (as well he might be) a Naturaliſt and a Philoſoper, did convince him, that the perſon then ſuffering was not only a juſt and righteous man, but alſo much more then, ἄνθρωπος ψιλὸς, meer man; for he ſaid, *Truly this was the Son of God*, *Mat.* 27. v. 54. Compared with *Luk.* 23. v. 46. Though it is evident that our Saviour had yet much of his blood remaining within him, when he loudly lowed out (if I may ſo ſpeak with all due reverence) that bitter Lamentation; for afterward it is ſaid, *one of the Souldiers with a ſpear pierced his ſide, and forthwith came there out blood and water*, Joh. 19. 34. Wherefore as for our *Razis*, it may be ſaid, if it could be without unpardonable blaſphemy, *Behold a greater than Chriſt is here*; for now when his blood *was quite all gone, he called upon the Lord of life and ſpirit*: yet this is no great matter, if conſidered with what is ſtill further reported of him: For now notwithſtanding all his blood was gone, he had not only Power and vigour to *call upon God*, but alſo *to pluck out his own bowels*, ſurely they hung very looſe, *and take them with both his hands*; it is ſtrange that neither of them was hurt and diſabled by his fall; *and caſt them upon the Throng*. If this be not a Thumper, I never heard one in my life.

But you will object, and ſay, theſe books of the *Maccabees* are not in the Kalendar, neither are they appointed to be read. I anſwer, though they are not in the Kalendar, yet they are in Apochrypha; of which in the whole Lump you are a ſtrenuous propugnator, without any Limitation or Exception. Nevertheleſs to give you all fair play imaginable, I will return from the *Maccabees* to the Hiſtory of *Tobit* and his Dog, which hath its courſe in the Desk, and that too by order, as well as any part of the Holy Bible it ſelf. *Tobit*, I ſay, *and his Dog*: For though you were pleaſed to flurt at me for mentioning of his dog, and ſay, *I ſuppoſe this Author does not know that the Fifth Chapter of* Tobit *is left out*, (that is, out of the Kalendar) where *Tobit* and his dog are found together; yet how cauſeleſly and weakly you do it, will inſtantly appear; inſomuch that if *Tobit's* dog were

p. 7 l. 13. yet alive he had reason enough to resent the injury with a snarl, and not only so, but also bite you by the heels, for putting such a slight and affront upon him; for why should you shut him out of the *Holy place*, as an unclean thing; since he is admitted and received as well as his Master? Yet suppose I had not known that the Fifth Chapter was left out, it would have no more challenged my knowledg or understanding, then if you should be upbraided with ignorance, because you know not to handle your needle, nor how to cut out a gown in right Mode & fashion, as well as any French Taylour in the Town; for what have you to do with such a knowledg? and so what have I to do with the Curiosity and intreague of the Kalendar in this particular? Yea, I believe your self would be put to a stand, to give a good and satisfactory account, why only that Fifth Chapter of the whole book of *Tobit*, should be left out? Why this rather then any of the rest, which are altogether *Ejusdem farinæ* of the same leven? And the rather, because if you observe it in this Fifth Chapter, the main plot and foundation of the whole Tragick-comedy is brought in and laid, as it is usual upon the stage, in some of the first scens. For here is *Raphael a great Angel of Heaven*, if you have Faith to believe, brought in under the disguise of a servant, and professes himself to *be* * *Azarias the Son of Ananias the great*; by what latitude of speech, I will not undertake to resolve, nor yet how decorously: for it is not usual nor slightly, that the Son of so great a man should need to turn serving-man. Well, notwithstanding he profers his service to *Tobit* the Son, v. 6. And is entertained to waite upon him in his Travail; *and so they went forth both and the young mans dog with him*, ver. 16. And it is this *Raphael*, this servant which teaches his young Master those unheard of Rarities, and puts him upon the performing those wonderful exploits in the followiug Acts. *Davus Omnia*: *Raphael* is all in all, and young *Tobit* is nothing without him. Why therefore this necessary scene of introduction, should be left out and omitted, and this *busie Davus* and most extraordinary servant should abruptly and suddenly appear, none understanding from whence or how, is wholly beyond my apprehension. I would gladly know, whether Mr. *Falkner*, (unto whom you owe much) in any of his great labours, and learned Exercitations

C. 12. 15.

C. 5. v. 12.

* *Hoc autem mendacium est, quo neq; deus neq; veri ipsius Angeli, in Canonicis libris leguntur usi: quod mendacium, ut excusemus, non magnopere putamus esse laborandum: quia (ut multæ rationes hinc inde comportentur) mendacium est mendacium, a deo & ab Electis ejus Angelis alienissimum.* So a true Expositor upon the place.

citations about the Liturgy, has given us the true reaſon of this Chaſme and Hiulcan leap in the Kalendar? Surely there is ſome Myſtery in it: but what, *Raphael* knows for all me. In the interim it may well purple your Cheeks, that you ſhould rather then not twit me with ignorance, betray your own; for though the Fifth Chapter is left out, and conſequently *Tobit*, and his Dog, yet if you had looked forward unto the Eleventh Chapter (ordered to be read) there you ſhall find *Tobit* and his Dog again: for thus it is recorded, v. 4. *So they went their way, and the Dog went after them.* And for the better convincing you of the truth of what I now ſpeak, be pleaſed, if you count it worth the while, to go to any of our Cathedral-Churches, next third day of *October*, in the forenoon in the year one thouſand Six hundred and eighty, and ſo *quotannis* for the future, and you will be ſatisfied. Saint *Paul's* is not yet reedified, therefore that of *weſt-minſter* is neareſt; where if you will do your devotions in that grave and ſolemn aſſembly, graced with the preſence of a great and generous Biſhop: together with his Prebends, Prieſts, and Deacons, beſides a loud Chorus of ſinging men, and ſinging boys alternatly reſponding; you ſhall ſee the reverend reader in due time and place coming out of his ſeat, firſt making his lowlie obeiſance, with his face to the earth towards the Holy Altar, though without a ſacrifice; and therefore why he ſo bows, is not a little Myſterious; and then turning about to ſhew the ſame reverence to the preſul of the quire, and going into the Pew, you ſhall hear him pronounce with a loud voice, theſe or the like words, *The holy leſſon appointed, for this morning ſervice is the Eleventh Chapter of the book of* Tobit; and then he proceeds to his work. *After theſe things* Tobias *went his ways praiſing God, that had given him a proſperous journey, and bleſſed* Raguel *and* Edna *his wife, and went on his way till he drew near to* Ninive. *Then* Raphael *ſaid to* Tobias; *thou knoweſt brother, how thou didſt leave thy father; let us haſt before thy wife, and prepare the houſe; and take in thine hand the Gaul of the Fiſh. So they went their way, and the Dog went after them.* I wonder there is no Aſterisk or finger in the margent pointing to the place, for it is *Valde Notabile*; and then you could not have ſo eaſily over-looked it. Give

me

me leave, for I think it innocent and harmleſs, and I am ſure 'tis opportune, to impart unto you a merriment. I once heard a young Lord (now a great and grave Senator) whoſe Tongue is excellently well hung, who to exerciſe his faculty of ſpeaking, would needs take upon him to preach *Extempore* (as he ſaid but too looſly,) and what ſhould be his Text, but this very verſe, though not exactly repeated to a letter, but in this manner, *So* Tobit *went out, and his dog followed him.* I remember his firſt work was to make inquiry, for he ſaid it was of great importance, What kind of Dog this might be, whether a Spaniel, Gray-hound, Water-dog, or ſome other: for from hence ſaid he, we may very probably find out the temper and genious of his Maſter. If this Dog were a Spaniel, then young *Tobit* in all likelihood was a Gentleman, and one who delighted in Hawking; but why then do we not read of an Hawk on his fiſt, as well as a dog at his heel? If this dog were a Gray-hound, then young *Tobit* took his pleaſure in Courſing: if this dog were a water-Spaniel, then young *Tobit's* recreation was Ducking. But yet perhaps the dog was none of all theſe, but rather a meer Pedlars-Cur; for it is ſaid, *the dog followed after him*, juſt like ſuch a Cur; for as for the forementioned they are ſeen to be more Aiery, metalſom and ſprightly *than heavily to follow after*, but Range up and down the fields far from their Maſters feet, and hunt after prey; and ſuch a dog might well ſute with his Maſters mean condition for the preſent, becauſe his Mother was but a kind of Chair-woman, as old *Tobit* the Father reports of her, Chap. 2. v. 11. *And my Wife* Anna *did take womans work to do*, by which ſhe earned her livelihood, v. 14. This and much more was his Oratory, which I liſt not further to repeat, and the rather, becauſe what I have ſaid already, is indeed more than ſufficient to convince you of your miſtake about *Tobit* and his dog. But beſides, I have ſeveral doubts ſtill remaining concerning old *Tobit* the Father, and young *Tobit* the Son; which how they can be ſolved, and received by others, as true and real, do utterly mate and non-plus my thoughts.

Concerning old *Tobit* the Father we read thus, Chap. 2. v. 9. *The ſame night I returned from the burial, and ſlept by*

C. 2. v. 4. 10

the

the Wall of my Court-yard, being polluted, and my face was uncovered; and I knew not that there were ſparrows in the wall, and mine eyes being open, the ſparrows muted warm dung into mine eyes, and a whiteneſs came into mine eyes; whereby he became blind. If he ſlept, how came it to paſs that his eyes were open? I have heard this to be the property of an hare (but I ſuppoſe it a vulgar error) and of nothing elſe living upon the earth. But though the good man ſlept with his eyes open, how could two ſparrows joyn by a Conſpiracy againſt him to make him blind? One ſparrow could not work him this miſchief alone by its ſingle muting; what did they ſecretly whiſper, and ſo by conſent, in one and the ſame moment, turn up their tailes, and let fall this into one eye, and that into the other, and put them out together? *Oh hateful unhappy birds!* elſe though ſuch a ſhrewd miſchance had befallen one of his eyes, yet the other might have been preſerved: ſurely he would have been more watchful for the future, after he had underſtood the danger of it.

Concerning young *Tobit* the Son we read thus, Chap. 6. 1, 2, 3. *And as they went on their journey, they came in the evening to the River* Tigris, *and they lodged there, and when the young man went down to waſh himſelf, a fiſh leaped out of the River, and would have devoured him; then the Angel* (his ſervant *Raphael*) *ſaid unto him, take the fiſh; and the young man laid hold of the fiſh, and drew it to land.* This was a ſtrange bold fiſh to forſake its own Element to devour a man. *Forte Hippopotamus*, ſaith *Grotius* upon the place: but it is forty to one that it was not; ſince that kind of water-beaſt (for ſo it may be called rather then a fiſh) is reported to live only in the River *Nile*, * and not in *Tigris*; and beſides it is of greater bigneſs and fierceneſs, than tamely to be laid hold on by the hand of any, and brought to land; only our young *Tobit*'s excepted; who had the ſtrength and valour to atchive this great enterprize. Well; drawn this fiſh is upon the bank, and by the appointment of the ſervant (for here the man commands the Maſter) it is gutted, or rather unbowelled, *the heart, liver, and gaul being taken out, and carefully preſerved*, v. 4. And not without cauſe, for in due time they will be found to be of an aſtoniſhing quality and vertue, working wonders. All the

* Plinie in his natural hiſtory having ſpoken of the Crocodile, ſaith further, Major altitudine in eodem Nilo Bellua hippopotamus editur caudâ & dentibus aprorum, tergoris ad ſcuta galeaſque impenetrabilis.

Tetragrammatons,

Tetragammaton, *Soleo-terrenos*, withall other the terrible hard names boasted of by your mountebanks, are not to be named the same day with them, as you shall hear, v. 6. *Then the young man said to the Angel, to what use is the heart, the liver, and Gall of the fish? And he said unto him, Touching the heart and the liver, if a Devil, or any evil Spirit trouble any, we must make a smoak thereof before the man or the woman, and the party shall be no more vexed: as for the Gall it is good to anoint a man that hath whiteness in his eyes, and he shall be healed.* This is repeated again, v. 16. *When thou shalt come into the marriage Chamber, thou shalt take the Ashes of perfume, and shalt lay upon them some of the heart and liver of the fish, and shalt make a smoak with it: and the Devil shall smel it, and and flee away, and never come again any more.* The reason of this (as you know) was thus; a Match was resolved upon by the Angel between young *Tobit* and a young Virgin that was lov'd by a devil; I assure you by all the faith of *Apocrypha* the devil *Asmodæus*, for that is his name, was desperately in love with her; and as a most jealous lover impatient of Rivals, had murdered and torn in peices, no less then seven men one after another, for pretending unto her; for so her father *Raguel* like an honest good man, plainly told this ignorant wooer (as he supposed) when he first brake his mind to him about the buness. Chap. 7. v. 10. *And* Raguel *said to* Tobias *it is meet, that thou shouldest marry my Daughter; nevertheless I will declare unto thee the truth; I have given my daughter in marriage to seven men, who dyed that night they came in unto her. For a wicked Spirit loved her.* Chap. 6. 14. And whosoever offered to touch her was sure to go to pot for it. Nevertheless to this frightful, fatal, and deadly bride young *Tobit* is designed and resolved to be the bridegroom: but how comes he to be so hardy and adventrous? because he had the heart and liver of the foresaid fish in a readiness by him, as a sure and safe amulet to fray away the foul fiend, and send him packing. I dare be bold to say, the devil of Mascon was not, as he said himself, more terrified with the *Cross and Holy water*, then this evil Spirit with the *smoak*, arising from the heart and liver of that watery monster. For so we read it, Chap. 8. v. 1. *And*

C.p. 3. v. 3.

when

When they had ſupped, they brought Tobias *in unto her; and as he went, he remembred the words of Raphael, and took the Aſhes of the perfumes, and put the heart and the liver of the fiſh thereupon, and made a ſmoak therewith; the which ſmel, when the evil Spirit had ſmelled, he fled into the uttermoſt parts of Egypt, and the Angel bound him.* Surely this ſmoak was a moſt Helliſh fogg, darker than ever any from the bottomleſs pit; and this ſmel a moſt diveliſh ſtrong ſmel to out-ſtink the devil, and put him thus to flight; no *Aſſa Fœtida* could be a thouſand part near ſo noiſome. It is commonly reported, that when the devil appears and frights people, at his departure for a farewell, he leaves an horrible Sulphureous ſtink behind him, ready to poyſon all in the room: but here was a more dreadful damnable breath, ſo that old nick the ſtinker was afraid to be poiſoned himſelf, and forced to hurry away, and remove farther off at a diſtance ſufficient, as will preſently appear. But in the interim I wonder how the Bride and the Bridegroom could abide by it? Yet poſſibly they had the cunning to ſtop their Noſes, until the ſmoak and ſmel was paſt and vaniſhed; and ſo might the devil, if he had not been a ſtark fool. A ſilly Devil indeed, to be frighted with ſmoak, and to be driven from his Amaſia with a ſmel! could he not (as I have ſaid) have ſtopped his noſe, and kept out the ſtink? Could he not have gone and opened the window for a little while, and relieved himſelf with the freſh and ſweet Air? could he not have ſmelled out before hand what was conſulted againſt him? could he not have provided himſelf with a counter-charm? could he not have furniſhed himſelf with ſome rare civet, musk, or other ſuch like perfume on the knob of his ſtaff: by whoſe ſweet and odoriferous ſent, he might eaſily have ſecured himſelf from thoſe baneful and killing Exhalations, and not received the leaſt dammage from them? Had he not been a meer fungus and dolt of a devil, he would have ſet his brains a work, and tryed a thouſand concluſions before he would have ſo meekly and patiently parted with his admired adored Miſtreſs; and left her in the boſome, and embraces of a ſtranger before his eyes. Yet poſſibly there might be an Antipathy, and a particular averſion in his nature againſt this foul fetour and venemous vapour; which therefore no ſooner did ſteam into his noſtrils but preſently put him into a cold ſweat,

and made his face look as pale as a white cloth. Alas poor Devil! What would you have him to do? he was ready to have fallen down into a ſown; therefore he had no remedy, as ſoon as ever he came to himſelf, but to flie for his life. But whether? c. 7. v. 1. the Text ſaith, *he fled to the uttermoſt parts of Egypt.* From whence? *From Ecbatane. Ecbatane* was the place where the great exploit was acted, a City of the *Medes*: *Media* is a country not far from the *Caſpian* Sea; between which and *Egypt* lieth all *Aſſyria*, and all the deſarts of *Arabia*, and the Red-Sea, and then the hither moſt parts of *Egypt*, and then over *Nilus*, and then the uttermoſt parts of *Egypt*---thither *Aſmodeus* fled and took Sanctuary in *montanis illis locis quibus Ægyptus a Lybia dirimitur*, in thoſe vaſt range of mountaines, by which *Egypt* and *Lybia* are divided. This was an huge long poſt, above a thouſand Miles, as I gueſs, in a right line; but how many windings and turnings he made, whether he went by the ſtring or the bow, who knows? *Aſmodeus* certainly wanted his box of ſnuſh; for had he but ſoundly ſneezed, it would have perfectly cleared his noſe of that peſtilent whiff, without going the hundred part of ſuch a tedious journy. But I would gladly be informed how, and in what manner this evil Spirit fled? whether by any Magical operation he changed himſelf into the ſhape of any Beaſt, Dromedary, Gray-hound or the like? or whether he changed himſelf into the ſhape of any Fowl, Stork, long wing'd Hawk or the like? or whether into the ſhape of an Oſtrich, and ſo by the help both of wings and heeles together ran faſter and ſwifter then any race-horſe, ſtraining out himſelf to the greateſt ſpeed to beat his fellow? Or if he continued in his old form without *Metamorphoſie*, whether he went on horſe-back, or in a Chariot, or made uſe of any other vehicle for his more ſuddain paſſage? well; though we know not the manner how, yet the place whether he fled for ſhelter, is plainly told us, *the uttermoſt parts of* Egypt; ſo great was his fright, that he durſt never ſtand ſtill nor look back until he was at that diſtance, and fully recovered that *Aſylum.* And yet his peril is not paſt; for no ſooner ſtood he ſtill, but the *Angel bound him.* Alas poor *Aſmodeus*, this was very ſevere after ſuch ſore Travail! but *Aſmodeus* muſt patiently endure it: for bound he was, not able to move hand or foot, not able to ſtir or turn himſelf this way or another; but perhaps continue in the ſame place and poſture unto this day. But it is now more than

high time to be ſerious. Has therefore a Spirit fleſh and bones? our Saviour ſaith, *it hath not.* Has a Spirit corporal parts, and bodily members? has a devil the Organs of carnal ſenſe? has he eyes to ſee, as man ſeeth? has he ears to hear, as man heareth? has he fingers to touch, as man toucheth? has he a palat to taſte, as man taſteth? or has he a noſe to ſmel, as man ſmelleth? *Thou ſhalt make a ſmoak with the liver and heart of the fiſh, and the devil ſhall ſmel it, and flee away,* very true: *his ſmelling and fleeing,* are both of the ſame certainty; no ſooner did he one, but he did the other alſo. But is the devil capable *of ſmelling*? even as much as the great huge ſtone (in an open ſtreet of the Town, wherein I was born) is capable of hearing: whereof it was commonly ſaid, as I well remember, to poor little Children, *That whenſoever it heard the Clock ſtrike twelve it turned thrice round*; and it was puzling enough to them. But is it poſſible for ſmoak or any material fume to affect, and excruciate an immaterial and ſpiritual being or eſſence, or put ſuch an exiſtency under the leaſt conſternation? Oh how does the devil laugh behind the curtain! Oh how is he pleaſed, that ſuch ludicrous repreſentations, and ridiculous ſtories ſhould be given out and credited concerning himſelf! Here is the old heatheniſh Doctrine revived and continued under Goſpel light (which teacheth us better things) of the *Gods or Daimons their burning in love, their burning in filthy luſt, with young beautiful Virgins and women*; as *Jupiter* was deeply in love with *Danae* the daughter of *Acriſius*, *Apollo* with *Daphne* the daughter of *Peneus*, and others in like manner: So here this Daimon or Devil is with *Sarah* the daughter of *Raguel. An evil Spirit loveth her*, ſaith *Tobias* unto *Raphael*, when he firſt mentioned the match unto him, Chap. 6. v. 14. But why? becauſe the *maid was fair and witty*, v. 12. So here again we have the Doctrine of *binding of Spirits, and of keeping them from walking and haunting our houſes and chambers*, with ſeveral other Ethnick poetical tales. All which, how they *may admit of a fair ſolution from being pure fable*, and impure impoſture and be reconciled to truth and reality as to matter of fact, you have it in a readineſs; and as for all objections to the contrary *you have promiſed to conſider.* In the interim I would gladly learn what profit, and edification can be propounded to the people in reading, and in hearing the whole Legend of *Tobit*, ſo likewiſe of *Judith*, *Bell and the Dragon and*

the reſt, which you ſay *are fit to be read in the Chriſtian Aſſembly*? Shall this Chriſtian aſſembly believe what is read unto them, or ſhall they not believe? If they believe, their minds are corrupted from the truth, and they believe lyes: if they believe not, what ſpiritual good and advantage can they reap and receive from ſuch light, frothy, vain, yea even almoſt defiling Romances? but that *ſuch ſtuff* (to uſe your own word in another Caſe) *ſuch paultry pitiful ſtuff* ſhould be named and avouched *to ſerve for inſtruction, comfort, and reproof as the Parables of our Saviour do*, filles me with wonder and aſtoniſhment. What, *ſhall the fable of the Virgin, ſweet-heart, and Miſs to the Devil*, who ſlew ſeveral innocent perſons in the nuptial chamber, leſt they ſhould touch her, *ſerve as much for inſtruction as the Parable of our Saviour*, concerning the Ten Virgins, whereof five were wiſe and five fooliſh, and theſe laſt ſhut out, and eternally repudiated for want of watchfulneſs and due preparation? *Or as the parable of our Saviour*, concerning a certain King making a Marriage for his Son, and inviting many to the wedding, who would not come, but ſpightfully intreated the Meſſengers; and were therefore *deſtroyed and their city burnt up*? What, *ſhall the fable of the ſmoak, and fuliginous ſteam from the heart and liver of the fiſh frighting*, and quite routing the devil, *ſerve for Conſolation as the Parable of our Saviour*, concerning the ſtrong man armed and keeping the Palace, yet overcome and caſt out by a ſtronger than himſelf? *Or like that Parable of our Saviour* (for ſo I think it may be ſtiled) when he ſaid to his Diſciples, *I beheld* Satan *as lightening fall from heaven*; behold I give you power to tread on Serpents, and
c. 12. 15. Scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy. What ſhall the *Condeſcenſion of* Raphael one of the ſeven holy Angels, which preſent the prayers of the Saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy one, ſhall I ſay his ſtooping down to become a *ſerving man* to young *Tobias*; or the *humility* reported *of Raguel* his mother, in taking woman's work to do; *ſerve for reproof to thoſe* proud and haughty ones, who will not ſtoop down to the loweſt and meaneſt ſervices, for the good of others, *as the infinite abaſement of our bleſſed*

Saviour,

Saviour, when he made himself of no reputation, but took upon him the form of a servant; and when he took a *towel and girded himself, poured water into a bason, washed his disciples feet, and wiped them with the towel wherewith he was girded?* Certainly such comparisons are not only odious, but most execrable and accursed. Wherefore what you have here spoken and uttered, was only I hope in a Transport of indiscret zeal to your cause in hand, and that δεύτεραι φροντίδες your second and more considerate thoughts will bring you into a better understanding. God grant it. Amen.

A word or two more to my last Confuter, and I have done.

Sir, In your large introduction towards the close of it, you tax me as one *guilty of Sacriledge*, and *who*, when time was, *according to common fame, would have greedily swallowed down a Steeple, only I could not do it either with the spire downward, lest it should have pricked my Conscience, nor with the Tower downwards, lest the weather Cock should have appeared at the Top, and shewn how the wind blew*: a very witty conceit, I promise you. And then you charge the whole generation of Non-conformists, *as making no scruple of swallowing Church and Church Lands*; yea you say, *They have already, if they be not belied* (that is well put in) *divided the spoil, and taken into their possession the houses of God*, by a Sacrilegious *prolepsin*. But as for you and your party, ye can wash you hands in innocency from any thing, every thing of like imputation, *and nothing can tempt you to such an hainous wickedness*. Wherefore I would humbly and peaceably enquire of you, *whether Conformists may not be Sacrilegious as well as Non-conformists?* or rather, let this be the little question, *whether persons may not be guilty of Sacriledge, that are stampt with a Sacerdotal Character as well as any other?* Sacriledge in the Greek is ἱεροσυλία, which properly signifies *a prey* or a making of a prey *of holy things*. The Latine word *Sacrilegium* signifies a stealing of sacred things: *Sacrilegium*, say some, is *quasi sacrilædium*, the violation, the abuse, the hurt of what is hallowed and devoted. From all; this

may

may be a diſcription of it, *viz.* Sacriledge is the alienating and wreſting of things devoted, and ſet apart to holy and ſacred uſes and ends, unto other, and contrary purpoſes. Here therefore we muſt enquire, to what uſes and ends the wealth, riches and the great revenues of the Church, were given and granted primarily and principally from God himſelf, and ſecondarily from the piety and charity of bountiful benefactours? and then we muſt ſearch again, whether they are piouſly and punctually appropriated to thoſe uſes, and expended upon thoſe ends, and not miſuſed any other way? Church riches, I take it *pro confeſſo*, were given and granted to carry on *Church work*. Now what is Church work, I mean eminently ſuch, but *animarum cura*, a looking diligently to the Souls of men, that they may not miſcarry and periſh eternally? Church work is to inſtruct the people, ſhewing them *the way they are to walk in, and the thing they are to do.* Church work is by a ſedulous ſtudy and endeavour in Word, Doctrine, Example, Prayer, and often renewed Exhortation *to turn people from darkneſs to light, from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveneſs of ſins, and an inheritance among thoſe that are ſanctified by the faith of Chriſt.* Church work is to bring people to the knowledg and obedience of the truth, to make them a *people fitted for the Lord*, to put them in a due capacity *to ſerve him in this world, and to enjoy him in the world to come.* Church men therefore who reap the harveſt of theſe donations, who poſſeſs this wealth, and divide theſe Revenues among themſelves, ought wholly *to give themſelves unto this ſervice*, and make the ſaving of precious Souls, and gaining them to Chriſt, their *main work and buſineſs.* But now is this their chief ſtudy and intendment? is this their conſtant imploy and negotiation? do they look upon themſelves as intruſted and honoured with Church-Offices, maintained and enriched with Church-goods to proſecute and expedite this high deſign, and moſt important affair with a moſt watchful and unwearied ſolicitude? O *Utinam* would to God there were ſuch an heart in them, but I am afraid it is far otherwiſe! Do we not ſee great names in the Church accumulating

living

living upon living, even the fatteſt beneſices, and ſome of them Dean's, and Prebend's places beſides to the value of three, four, five, Six hundred pounds *per annum* and more, and yet are never ſatisfied. *They run greedily after the errour of Balaam for a reward.* O ſordid Covetouſneſs utterly beneath the height, and ſublimity of raiſed winds! but how much abhorrent is it from the rare and heavenly philoſophy of the Goſpel, which ſaith, *love not the world, nor the things of this world; feed the flock of God---not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind---and when the chief Shepherd ſhall appear, ye ſhall receive a Crown of glory, which fadeth not away.* True and good Church-men ſhould be better verſed in theſe, and in the like *Golden ſayings* of the Spirit, than baſely to covet ſuch an evil covetouſneſs, which caſteth no little ſhame and reproach upon their perſons and profeſſion. What ſhall all your generous ſtudies, and great acquirements of learning, for which ye are renowned and dignified, teach you no other leſſon, but *inhiare pecuniæ* to queſt after mony, quarry upon the droſs and dung of this world, and load your ſelves with thick clay! Surely you underſtand higher matters. The Sons of the earth, who never knew more than the cart and plough, can attain to this excellency, almoſt as well as your ſelves: conformity therefore here is a moſt debaſing deformity, which ye ought to reject with an holy haughtineſs of diſdain. And the rather, becauſe herein alſo ye are very injurious and *grievous Oppreſſours.* Of whom? Even of your fellow brethren, the *Tribe* of *Levi*; not ſuffering them to have any lot, ſhare, and portion with you in *the good things of the Church*, againſt all right and equity. Ye graſp and run away with all, and they can get nothing to their great diſcouragement. How many ſad complaints have theſe ears of mine heard againſt Pluralities, from the mouths of thoſe that are as conforming, and ſome of them as meriting as your ſelves! They wait and wait till their hearts ake, even as the impotent and lame at the Pool of *Bethesda*, for the ſtirring of the waters, I mean for an opportunity of preferment,

ferment, but in vain; for no ſooner can the bleſſed Angel appear, any ſuch place known to be vacant, but another inſtantly ſteppeth in before them, and bereaves them of their hope. Some famed Doctor or Court-favourite like the ſharp eyed Eagle *ſeeth the prey afar of*, truſſeth it in his talons, and ſwiftly hurries it away to his former heap; while theſe poor wretches lie languiſhing with vexing diſpair in their continual diſappointments. The heart of man is deceitful, yet ſurely if I can know any thing by my ſelf, were I in your ſtead, I would have ſo much goodneſs and kindneſs, for thoſe of mine own coat and function, as to be willing they ſhould live by me, yea, and live comfortably upon the altar as well as my ſelf, according to the mind and appointment of the firſt Donour in the caſe. I would not be an Oppreſſour but a comforter unto them, ſeeking by all good ways and means to keep them up in heart and countenance, and ſtrengthen their hands in the work before them. But to return to our purpoſe. What ſignal ſervice do ſuch great Doctors, and Pluraliſts perform unto God and his Church? what uſe do they make of their vaſt incomes and ſalaries? how do they anſwer the truſt repoſed in them? how good and faithful are they in their Steward-ſhip? we ſee them *rem facere* purchaſing eſtates, we ſee them riding up and down with coach and horſes in great pomp and glory. But is nothing more expected from them? is this the end of the Church's bounty and liberality? their wages plainly point out to another work, as moſt neceſſary incumbent upon them without diſpenſation; which yet they can eaſily obtain to their great eaſe and content. As for teaching the people the good knowledg of God, and a conſtant conſcientious inſtructing them in the way of Salvation, they can do it by a Proxy. It is enough for ſome of them, to eat of the fat and drink of the ſweet, while others labour in the word and doctrine; to fleece the flock, while others feed them. But now who are their under-ſhepherds? who their ſubſtitutes, and under-feeders? many of them ſorry feeders, God wot! pitiful hirelings, whoſe ſalaries are ſo ſmal, as utterly to diſcourage and diſenable them, from any chearful, and vigorous attending upon ſacred things: Alas ſeveral of them are neceſſitated, to turn petty ſcriveners writing bills and bonds, and ſtoop to ſuch ſervile offices to patch

Job. 39. 29.

up

up a livelihood. *what reverence and honour* can be paid to ſuch perſons by the people; which is moſt abſolutely neceſſary for the ſucceſs of their Miniſtry? *Hobb* and *John* the meaneſt plowman in the Pariſh, is ready to behave himſelf inſolently againſt them, and thinks himſelf as good a man, as he who talks to him out of the Pulpit; why! he is but the poor Curate, and not the principal man; he is but the Uſher and the School-boys regard him not, for the Maſter, whom they only fear and reverence, is abſent and elſewhere. A noble Lord, then lately returned from his long travail, among other things told me, that the *French* did wonderfully vilifie, and ſet at naught ſuch ſubſtitutes ſent amongſt them to officiate from the Lord Abbots, and great Clergy-men, ſtyling them commonly, *Poures Diables*, Poor Devils, in ſcorn and deriſion. But now ſhall *theſe* be thought worthy to be the *Embaſſadours of God*, and the Repreſentatives of Chriſt? can *theſe* rule over the houſe of God? can *theſe* be ſuppoſed to have a throne in the hearts of the people, and to ſpeak unto them with all authority and power? Alas their perſons are vile, their preaching vaine, and their oratory contemptible! Oh what diſſervice, inſtead of ſervice, is hereby done unto Chriſt and his Church! Oh how are the people hereby prompted to atheiſm and impenitency, and ſo ſent thronging to Hell, rather than awfully awakened with fear and repentance, and ſo brought home unto God! I wonder *conſcience* flies not in the face of ſome perſons concerned; who cannot but be ſenſible, that what I now write in great meaſure is according to truth. I would not bring ſuch guilt of the blood of Souls upon mine own Soul, to reap the whole profit now in the hands of all the Church-men of *England* put together. But in the interim, are not they guilty of Sacriledge? I think, if any other, theſe may be arraigned for it with a witneſs, and ſtand charged with it in a moſt notorious manner. Suppoſe a Knight, or Gentleman, has a Parſonage or Living in his gift, of two or three hundred pounds *per annum*; he puts in a Parſon or Miniſter, but yet by ſome clancular pact and condition, reſerves a third of the profits to himſelf; the Clerk preſented is of moſt approved abilities for the place, and carries himſelf worthily in it. Notwithſtanding, if this thing be known, the Patron ſhall be ſharply,

and ſeverely cenſured, as one that hath unpardonably violated the rights of the Church, and *hainous Sacriledge* ſhall be imputed to him; the poor Miniſter ſhall be outed for Simony, and another will quickly force in upon the Premiſes. But who is the man? perhaps ſome great Doctor, who has ſeveral Church-promotions already, but he muſt, and will have another, ſince it falls ſo luckily in his way. Well; he comes, and according to Law takes full and quiet poſſeſſion; but then he being elſewhere richly accommodated, and pleaſantly ſeated, cannot think of removing, but ſends his Curate to do the work for him; and for his Salary allows him not half ſo much, as the true Patron did the former Incumbent: he has found out a Ten pound *Levite*, and that ſhall ſuffice, all the reſt muſt come to his own purſe, to keep up his port, and for other certain uſes beſt known to himſelf; nevertheleſs here is nothing of Sacriledge in the caſe; who dares to think, or ſpeak ſuch a word? No, here is nothing but what is right and praiſe-worthy in the whole procedure. Fye upon it! How does covetouſneſs blind our eyes? How does evil cuſtom impoſe upon our reaſon and judgment? is it odious and deteſtable Sacriledge in one perſon, and not in another? can meerly *taking holy Orders*, take away the name and thing of what we call *Sacriledge*? can the *putting on a canonical habit*, put off all guilt and demerit in that kind? then let the aforeſaid Knight, or Gentleman, be made a Clergy-man, and immediately he is *rectus in Curia*, and no longer Sacrilegious. Be not deceived, God is not mocked. To conclude, the Curate, or perſon ſubſtituted, who ever he be, that actually performs the office, and does the duty of the Miniſter, either he is worthy or elſe he is unworthy of the place. If he be unworthy, then much more unworthy you to thruſt ſuch an unable and unmeet man upon the people, to their apparent ruin and deſtruction. He ſaid haughtily like himſelf, *Viderit utilitas*, hang gain, I will look to mine honour: and you ſay in your actions, not only ſordidly but impiouſly. *Viderint animæ*, let Souls be damn'd if they will; I muſt and will look to my gain, and to have a good income. But if he be worthy, then the dues and profits ariſing from the ſaid place, both by the Law of God, and of the Land (if pure juſtice and right might not be wreſted from its direct and firſt intention)

intention) do, *ipſo facto*, belong unto the ſaid Miniſter or Curate, as in the reward of his ſervice; and I think it both oppreſſion and ſacriledge, by any plea or pretext (though of being legally the Rector or Parſon of the pariſh) to detain them from him. Thus much in requital, for your charge of *Sacriledge, and my ſwallowing down a Steeple, when time was*, with the Spire upward or downward, whether you pleaſe. Farewell.

FINIS.

FINIS.

16663

REPRODUCED FROM THE ORIGINAL
IN THE HENRY E. HUNTINGTON
LIBRARY AND ART GALLERY.
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.
PERMISSION NECESSARY FOR
REPRODUCTION.